

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most loving Father, we would lay our humble tributes at Thy feet and testify of Thy greatness and providential care. We pray that our thought, our charity, and our freedom from all resentment may conspire to mold our character, well pleasing in Thy sight. We are called to be true, to be genuine, and to cultivate the spirit of calm content. Let the doors of our hearts be wide enough to receive all human love and narrow enough to shut out all hate and prejudice.

Dear Lord, our responsibility is a sacred trust; help us to look on it solemnly, to stand up and walk beneath it steadfastly and falter not. In this world theater of human confusion and action, we pray that we may come to the throne of self-conquest and thus become leaders of a forceful, contagious ardor for those whose paths of joy seem reft and whose aspirations lie in the dust. Oh, bless them with the unlocked treasures of a good God that they may realize that the greatest thing one can do with his life is to lay it down, thus living out the reality of the in-living Christ. Oh, sanctify all hidden sorrow and grant that the underwail of those who mourn may not obtrude or stifle the way of a conquering faith; let these years of our discipline be lost in the peace of a better world. In the holy name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 10, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On December 10, 1942:

H. R. 5898. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard Almas; and

H. R. 7162. An act to suspend for the duration of the war certain requirements of section 11 (a) of the Federal Register Act of 1935.

On December 11, 1942:

H. R. 331. An act for the relief of the Mount Whitney Power & Electric Co.;

H. R. 2436. An act for the relief of Hjalmar M. Seby;

H. R. 5714. An act for the relief of William H. Cogswell, Jr.; and

H. R. 7568. An act to discharge more effectively the obligations of the United States under certain treaties relating to the manufacture and distribution of narcotic drugs, by providing for domestic control of the production and distribution of the opium poppy and its products, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without

amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 194. An act for the relief of the Upham Telephone & Electric Co., Upham, N. Dak.;

H. R. 1646. An act for the relief of George Gels, and the administrator of the estate of Joseph Glaser, deceased;

H. R. 2894. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Butak, Dorothy Clyde, Mrs. Albert Westcott, Mrs. Albert Meyer, Florence Johnson, Marie Grill, Mrs. Leo Maloney, Marian McDonald, Mrs. Edward Beier, Mrs. E. L. Bly, Mrs. Lucien Miller, Lois Kehnl, Reka Berg, Mrs. Ollis Klicker, Wilma Vogler, and Mary Chisholm;

H. R. 2970. An act for the relief of Hyram Colwell;

H. R. 2973. An act for the relief of George O. Hanford;

H. R. 4029. An act for the relief of Catherine Barrett;

H. R. 4741. An act for the relief of the Midwest Oil Co.;

H. R. 4898. An act for the relief of Bothilda Stender;

H. R. 5154. An act for the relief of the estate of Elmer White;

H. R. 5157. An act to reimburse F. E. Webster for labor and material used in the emergency construction of buildings and utilities at Civilian Conservation Corps Camp Escanaba;

H. R. 5175. An act for the relief of Edward Workman;

H. R. 5274. An act for the relief of Michael Leo Fitzpatrick;

H. R. 5409. An act for the relief of Gwendolyn Anne Olhava and Anthony L. Olhava;

H. R. 5649. An act for the relief of Alice Comas, Robert Comas, and Frances Williams;

H. R. 6095. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. H. L. Smith, deceased;

H. R. 6179. An act for the relief of Thomas H. VanNoy;

H. R. 6285. An act for the relief of Clarence A. Houser and his wife, Mrs. Jewel Houser;

H. R. 6366. An act for the relief of Alex Lawson;

H. R. 6370. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ching Shee (Ching Toy Wun);

H. R. 6489. An act for the relief of I. Arthur Kramer;

H. R. 6510. An act for the relief of L. H. Miller;

H. R. 6520. An act for the relief of Jane A. Thornton;

H. R. 6569. An act for the relief of William M. Miller;

H. R. 6653. An act for the relief of William R. Ivey;

H. R. 6677. An act for the relief of Ronald Leroy Chen;

H. R. 6695. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Mann;

H. R. 6749. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Schakett;

H. R. 6771. An act for the relief of Lillian J. Delavergne and Myrla Delavergne;

H. R. 6780. An act for the relief of J. M. Jesse;

H. R. 6863. An act for the relief of Thomas W. Dowd;

H. R. 6873. An act for the relief of Maude Leach;

H. R. 6923. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ada F. Ogle;

H. R. 6924. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Gordon;

H. R. 7012. An act for the relief of Litchfield Bros., Aurora, N. C.;

H. R. 7035. An act for the relief of Mr. Garland Galley, of Baldwin, Ga., and Mrs. Clara Mae Galley, of Baldwin, Ga.;

H. R. 7167. An act for the relief of Elmore Lee Lane;

H. R. 7168. An act for the relief of Grover C. Wedgwood;

H. R. 7185. An act for the relief of Mrs. James Q. Mattox;

H. R. 7247. An act for the relief of Silas Frankel;

H. R. 7288. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers;

H. R. 7316. An act for the relief of Dr. J. M. Scott and Mrs. J. M. Scott;

H. R. 7333. An act for the relief of Arkansas Gazette, Hope Star, the Hope Journal, Arkansas Democrat Co.;

H. R. 7518. An act for the relief of Bernice Pyke, Arthur P. Fenton, Carl E. Moore, and Clifford W. Pollock;

H. R. 7649. An act for the relief of Ralph B. Randall, rural rehabilitation supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Visalia, Calif.;

H. R. 7650. An act for the relief of Col. Leo A. Luttringer, United States property and disbursing officer for Pennsylvania;

H. R. 7651. An act for the relief of William F. Perkins, rural rehabilitation supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Pinal County, Ariz.;

H. R. 7652. An act for the relief of Warren M. Engstrand, grant supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Bakersfield, Calif.;

H. R. 7653. An act for the relief of Ensign Donald L. Grunsky;

H. R. 7705. An act for the relief of James E. Savage;

H. R. 7781. An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7844. An act to amend sections 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the act approved March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.), providing for continuing pay and allowances of certain missing persons; and

H. J. Res. 365. Joint resolution to amend the Revenue Act of 1942.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 137. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional United States district judge for the eastern district of Missouri;

H. R. 4918. An act for the relief of Anna J. Krogoll;

H. R. 5444. An act to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5486. An act to provide for means of egress for buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5812. An act for the relief of William E. Averitt and United States Casualty Co.;

H. R. 6839. An act relating to the appointment and retirement in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve of persons with physical disabilities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7171. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. C. Tommey;

H. R. 7357. An act for the relief of Madeline Flori;

H. R. 7522. An act to amend the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, so as to authorize the use of public-school buildings in the District of Columbia as and for day nurseries and nursery schools, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7587. An act for the relief of Etta A. Thompson, Marion E. Graham, Irene Morgan, and Alice K. Weber; and

H. R. 7633. An act to increase the pay and allowances of members of the Army Nurse Corps, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in

which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 644. An act for the relief of Hiller & Wilbur, Inc.;

S. 1214. An act to provide for the payment of the claim of John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, arising out of a contract between said deceased and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the construction of seagoing tugs;

S. 2176. An act for the relief of the heirs of John J. Shields;

S. 2375. An act for the relief of Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, and Margaret Groom Turpin;

S. 2610. An act for the relief of Richard Barker;

S. 2899. An act to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States;

S. 2904. An act to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution authorizing a change in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2528) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2341. An act to amend the act approved March 14, 1936, entitled "an act to provide for vacations for Government employees, and for other purposes";

S. 2353. An act to amend sections 1305 and 1306 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to eliminate the prohibition against payment of deposits, and interest thereon, of enlisted men until final discharge;

S. 2769. An act to authorize the rank of rear admiral in the Dental Corps of the United States Navy;

S. 2852. An act to authorize the President to confer decorations and medals upon units of, or persons serving with, the military forces of cobelligerent nations; and

S. 2889. An act to further the war effort by authorizing the substitution of other materials for strategic metals used in minor coinage, to authorize the forming of worn and uncurrent standard silver dollars into bars, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1666) entitled "An act to coordinate Federal reporting services, to eliminate duplication and reduce the cost of such services, and to minimize the burdens of furnishing information to Federal agencies."

OFFICE OF FISCAL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANHAM addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LXXXVIII—599

MEXICAN CLAIMS BILL

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 40, which authorizes the Secretary of the Senate to make a slight technical correction in the enrollment of the so-called Mexican claims bill as agreed to by the two Houses.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2528) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico, to strike out the words "section 6 (b)" where they appear in section 8 (c) thereof and insert in lieu thereof the words "sections 4 (b), 4 (c), and 6 (b)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the same resolution which was under consideration in the Senate, where there was vigorous opposition and almost the entire minority party opposed it on account of the constitutional issue involved?

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman is talking about another bill entirely.

Mr. Speaker, this technical correction should have appeared in the conference report as submitted, but it was omitted inadvertently in the drafting of the conference report. It simply provides that the words "section 6 (b)" be stricken out where they appear in section 8 (c) and to insert in lieu thereof the words "sections 4 (b), 4 (c), and 6 (b)."

Mr. FISH. You are not bringing up the Mexican claims bill or another Mexican claims bill?

Mr. BLOOM. No.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation and do not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DECORATIONS BESTOWED UPON HUGH S. CUMMING, SURGEON GENERAL (RETIRED)

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 140, granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General (retired) of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of Colombia, Haiti, and Chile.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General (retired) of the United States Public Health Service, be authorized to accept and wear the decoration of "Order of Boyacá" tendered by His Excellency, the Ambassador from Colombia, in the name of the Republic of Colombia; the decoration of "Honneur et Mérito" (grade of commander), tendered by His Excellency, the Minister from Haiti, in the name of the Republic of Haiti; and the decoration "El Merito", tendered by

His Excellency, the Ambassador from Chile, in the name of the Republic of Chile, all of which decorations have been conferred upon Surgeon General Hugh S. Cumming (retired), by the republics mentioned, for scientific service, and that the Department of State is hereby authorized and permitted to deliver the above-mentioned decorations to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General (retired) of the United States Public Health Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The Senate joint resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders that may have been entered, the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. KING] may be allowed to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after all business on the Speaker's desk has been completed and after all previous orders have been concluded, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes, under a special order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the regular business on tomorrow I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REGULATING BARBERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5444) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, line 10, strike out "proper."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what this amendment does?

Mr. RANDOLPH. This amendment, I may say, in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio, simply strikes out the word "proper" and leaves the language reading "upon a showing." The Senate deleted the word "proper", feeling

that when it was stated "upon a showing" there would be consideration of the matter.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDMENT OF BUILDING CODE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5486) to provide for means of egress for buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out "in which sleeping quarters for the accommodation of 10 or more persons are provided above the first floor."

Page 2, line 7, strike out all after "buildings" down to and including "feet" in line 15.

Page 3, line 14, strike out all after "stations," down to and including "station" in line 16.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the amendments?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; the amendments passed by the Senate are three. The first has to do with sleeping quarters for the accommodation of 10 or more persons, when the quarters are provided above the first floor.

In this connection I should like to say that authority is vested in the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. There is in effect legislation which already permits the Commissioners to enjoin the owner and the lessee and the occupants from the use of a building unless they fully comply with precautionary fire escapes and other equipment prescribed. This implements the safety measures.

The second and third Senate amendments give discretion to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with respect to fire-alarm systems, and so forth.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAY NURSERIES IN PUBLIC SCHOOL BUILDINGS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7522) to amend the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, so as to authorize the use of public school buildings in the District of Columbia as and for day nurseries and nursery schools, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 15 to 23, inclusive, and lines 1 and 2 on page 3, and insert:

"Sec. 3. The sponsoring agency is authorized and directed to exact from the parent,

parents, or guardian of any child admitted to the day nurseries or nursery schools authorized by this act a fee commensurate with the ability of such parent, parents, or guardian to pay, as determined by such sponsoring agency: *Provided*, That such sponsoring agency is authorized to admit without charge any child whose parent, parents, or guardian are unable to make any contribution. All fees collected under the provisions of this act shall be paid to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia and deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the account 'Miscellaneous trust fund deposits, District of Columbia, day nurseries,' and shall be disbursed in the same manner as other trust funds are disbursed by the District of Columbia. The said trust fund shall be available to pay any necessary expenses incident to the operation of the day nurseries or nursery schools authorized by this act, not otherwise provided for."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the amendments?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. The Senate struck out section 3 of the House bill which would have provided for the use of W. P. A. funds. Now that the W. P. A. has been or is being liquidated by Presidential order it was felt that that section should be deleted.

A new section was added to the bill in which it was stated we would admit the children of parents who could not pay nursery fees provided a sliding scale of charges would be inserted commensurate with the ability of the parents to pay; and, secondly, in that connection, that all fees collected should be paid to the office of the tax collector of the District of Columbia for deposit in the United States Treasury in a trust fund to be disbursed for the necessary expenditures incident to the program of the nursery schools for the District of Columbia.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is it not the general practice to have the funds covered into the Treasury and to be disbursed by appropriation of Congress rather than to have it remain in a trust fund to be spent without appropriation?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am sorry, but I am unable to answer the gentleman's question as to the usual practice.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is an initial undertaking for which there has been no appropriation. We are hopeful that no appropriation will be necessary.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is true. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I think that is the correct situation. As the gentleman from Illinois said, we are earmarking these funds in the hope that it will not be necessary to make an appropriation from the Federal Treasury.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA J. KROGOLL

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4918)

for the relief of Anna J. Krogoll, with Senate amendment thereto and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MEYER]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the amendment simply reduces the amount?

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. The Senate amendment reduces the amount from \$5,000 to \$500. As the bill passed the House the sum of \$5,000 was provided.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How did the House ever pass a bill with such an amount and have it reduced in that manner?

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. The author of the bill has asked that the House agree to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MEYER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARION E. GRAHAM ET AL.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7587) for the relief of Etta A. Thompson, Marion E. Graham, Irene Morgan, and Alice K. Weber, with Senate amendment thereto and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Etta A. Thompson, Marion E. Graham, Ruth Irene Morgan, and Alice K. Weber."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MEYER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM E. AVERITT AND UNITED STATES CASUALTY CO.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5812) for the relief of William E. Averitt and United States Casualty Co., with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "and to United States Casualty Co., the sum of \$1,879.54."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "such sums" and insert "this sum."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "their claims" and insert "the claim of William E. Averitt."

Page 1, lines 10 and 11, strike out "and the payment of compensation by the United States Casualty Co."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of William E. Averitt."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MEYER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MADLINE FIORI

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7357) for the relief of Madeline Fiori, with Senate amendment thereto and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Mrs. Bulah" and insert "Madeline."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MEYER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE IN PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS OF ARMY NURSE CORPS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7633) to increase the pay and allowances of members of the Army Nurse Corps, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after "and" where it appears the second time, insert "money."

Page 1, line 5, strike out "including" and insert "for subsistence and rental of quarters, and."

Page 2, line 9, after "and" where it appears the first time, insert "money."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "including" and insert "for subsistence and rental of quarters, and."

Page 4, after line 20, insert:

"Sec. 6. During the present war and for 6 months thereafter, the President is authorized to provide for the appointment or enrollment in the Medical Department of the Army of technical and professional, female personnel in categories required for duty outside the continental United States. Such personnel shall be distributed, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, in relative ranks and grades corresponding to the commissioned and enlisted grades of the Regular Army; and the Secretary shall have complete authority to define the qualifications for all of the grades in which such personnel are distributed. Such personnel shall receive pay and money allowances for subsistence and rental of quarters and mileage and other travel allowances, as now or hereafter provided by law for military personnel of comparable grade, without dependents. Persons so appointed and their dependents shall be entitled to the same allowances and the same rights, privileges, benefits, and gratuities as members of the Army Nurse Corps and their dependents. Persons so enrolled and their dependents shall be entitled to the same allowances and the same rights, privileges, benefits, and gratuities as enlisted men of the Regular Army and their dependents."

Page 4, after line 20, insert:

"Sec. 7. That hereafter, during the present war and for 6 months thereafter, the superintendent and all other members of the

Navy Nurse Corps shall have relative rank and be entitled to receive the same pay, and money allowances for subsistence and rental of quarters, and mileage and other travel allowances as are authorized by this act for corresponding grades and relative ranks in the Army Nurse Corps. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to use appropriations available to the Naval Establishment to carry into effect the provisions of this section."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas explain these amendments?

Mr. THOMASON. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the amendments added to the bill by the Senate include only two important ones. First, the bill as amended includes Navy nurses. As to the other important amendment, the bill as it passed the House included nurses and also physiotherapists and dietitians. It will be recalled, however, that other groups such as dental hygienists and occupational therapists, were not included, but insist that they should be included. The amendment placed in the bill by the Senate leaves the matter to the discretion of the War and Navy Departments. If there are any others of these groups who are needed, outside of those mentioned in the House bill, or who may be needed for service outside the continental United States, the War and Navy Departments shall accept such as may be needed, and their pay and rank and allowances shall be the same as those of the nurses, dietitians, and physiotherapists, as provided in the House bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The chief amendment is to extend the legislation to the nurses of the Navy?

Mr. THOMASON. That, and to the other groups I have just mentioned.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has the committee agreed to it?

Mr. THOMASON. Such of the members of the committee as are on the floor of the House and available are unanimously for it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN SWEENEY

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7828) for the relief of John Sweeney.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of all laws of the United States and all regulations thereunder, John Sweeney, of Paris, Tenn., who—

(1) was born in Paris, Tenn., in 1885;

(2) resided in Canada from 1910 until 1917, during which time he went through naturalization proceedings for the purpose of becoming a citizen of Canada;

(3) returned to the United States in 1917 and was informed that his naturalization as a citizen of Canada was ineffective and that he was still a citizen of the United States;

(4) has resided in the United States since 1917, believing himself to be a citizen of the United States; and

(5) is now engaged in the construction of important works for the United States in Trinidad, shall be deemed to be, and to have been since his birth, a citizen of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "Tennessee", strike out the remainder of page 1 and lines 1 to 6, on page 2.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6839) relating to the appointment and retirement in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve of persons with physical disabilities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after "have", insert "other than organic."

Page 2, line 1, strike out all after "Reserve" down to and including "officer" in line 3.

Page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out "with which he was suffering" and insert "for which waiver was required."

Page 2, line 7, strike out all after "aggravation" down to and including "Such" in line 10, and insert "of such disability: Provided further, That such."

Page 2, line 11, after "service", insert "And provided further, That except for retirement based upon disability for which waiver is required under this act, or aggravation of such disability, this act shall not be construed to deprive any person of any right or benefit authorized under any other act."

Page 2, after line 11, insert:

"Sec. 2. For the purposes of applying section 607 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, or section 302 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, any disability for which waiver was required as a condition to tender of commission under this act shall be deemed to be a disability resulting from an injury or disease traceable to the extra hazard of military or naval service."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New Jersey explain the bill?

Mr. SUTPHIN. This is a bill that was introduced by my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS]. It permits the Navy and the Marine Corps to enlist men with physical disabilities other than organic, provided they waive their right to claim certain disability compensation.

Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] wish to make any further explanation of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The legislation is approved by the Department?

Mr. SUTPHIN. It is.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will this bill in any way permit men to go into the service who are now physically incapacitated, and because of their entrance into the service require the Government to pay them a pension?

Mr. SUTPHIN. That is just what the bill is for, to prevent that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN AND WESTERN DISTRICTS OF MISSOURI

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 137) to provide for the appointment of one additional United States district judge for the eastern district of Missouri, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment, with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That the President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional United States district judge, who shall be an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri. The judge so appointed shall at the time of his appointment be a resident and a citizen of the State of Missouri."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. HOBBS. This bill, as passed by the House, created what is known as a temporary judgeship for the eastern district of Missouri. The Senate amended the bill by making it a permanent judgeship for the eastern and western districts of Missouri. The House Committee on the Judiciary considered the bill as so amended by the Senate, and authorized the making of the request that has just been made, for unanimous consent to take up the bill, agree to the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HOBBS. Will the gentleman withhold his objection to let me explain the amendment that is proposed to be offered by our Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I withhold the objection so that the gentleman may finish his explanation.

Mr. HOBBS. The House Committee on the Judiciary in considering the matter decided that they would recommend that the House insist upon the original House version creating simply a temporary judgeship, but concur in the Senate amendment to the extent of making it apply to both the eastern and western districts.

If, therefore, the consent requested be granted and the recommendation of your committee be followed, the final result would be the creation of one temporary judgeship for the eastern and western districts of Missouri—one judge for the two districts.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative business and other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PAY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is the prerogative of the Congress to fix the compensation and hours of work of Government employees. I, for one, do not want to hand that power over to the President; but if we are not to do so, then it is up to the Congress to function in the matter. A serious situation exists at present in regard to the lower-paid Government employees. Everyone knows an increase is long past due in their case, and everyone knows there are inequalities that have got to be ironed out. Before this Congress adjourns, absent Members should, if necessary, be summoned to Washington so that we may do our duty with regard to this matter. Before this I have pointed out that the way to prevent giving more power to the Executive is for Congress to do so good a job that such action will not be necessary. This is a case in point.

PATENT FOR CERTAIN LANDS IN FLETCHER, OKLA.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2393), amending the provisions governing the issuance of patents for certain lands in the town of Fletcher, Okla.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What does this bill do?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this bill simply provides for a clearance of title to certain pieces of land in this town in Oklahoma, that were conveyed to the Government subject to being used for certain definite purposes. These pieces of land are situated in various parts of the town and they cannot be used for the purpose provided in the grant. This simply gives the United States the right to take out of the deed

that provision and grant a fee simple to the town.

Mr. RICH. Are they oil lands?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No.

Mr. RICH. Are the lands valuable?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The lands are good only for municipal purposes, and the money that is received goes to the city. The city purchased these lands, and the deed granted the land with a provision that they should be used only for certain purposes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And this bill gives title from the Federal Government to the city government?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes; it does, in a sense. Title is already in the city, subject to certain reservations that the lands must be used for park purposes. This bill would take out that reservation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And the lands are being used for park purposes now?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; this is vacant land, and it cannot be used at all, until we permit it to be used for other purposes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. For what purpose is it going to be used?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. They are small tracts of land, and the town will sell them to people to live on, I suppose.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How close to this community are there any oil lands?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I do not know. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is here, and may be able to tell us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. There is no oil land near this.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is there any possibility that the Government may be relinquishing land that may prove to be very valuable because of mineral rights?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Not at all. In fact, the lands are worthless.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The Government has already conveyed title to the lands.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the Government reserve all mineral rights to these lands?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; the Government is going to convey title in fee simple to these particular lands.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. These lots are in the district that I represent. The lots are worthless, they are growing up with weeds, and have been for 20 years. This little town is anxious to have the lots in order to make some improvements.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why could we not put an amendment in the bill, that in the event oil is discovered—

Mr. KNUTSON. Just simply say that we reserve the mineral rights to the land.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That would not make any difference to the Federal Government, because the Federal Government has already conveyed the lands subject to their being used for park purposes, so that the Federal Government

has no interest in the lands at the present time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We gave the lands for park purposes, and now it is proposed to give the lands for other purposes. If not used for park purposes it would of course revert to the Federal Government.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; the Government conveyed with the provision that they must be used for park purposes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Originally this was Government land, and they gave it for park purposes without restrictions.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And now you are asking the Government to give it to use for any purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, no.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We have a right to provide a restriction, if we wish.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I think the gentleman does not thoroughly understand. This is land in a little city in Oklahoma that was purchased from the Government by the city for the purpose at that time of establishing parks. It was purchased from the Government, and in the deed there was a provision that the lands must be used for park purposes. Some of it has been used for park purposes, and the rest of it consists of little tracts of land scattered throughout the city, and the land has been growing up in weeds for 20 years. Now the city wants us to convey to them without this provision in the deed, with the understanding and with the provision that is in the bill that the money that is received from these lands shall go into the city treasury for certain definite purposes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the money for the sale of the land should go to the Federal Treasury if there is any.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. To all intents and purposes, the Government has relinquished all of its rights, title, and interests in the land?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Absolutely; yes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Now the Government could not reserve any right in anything else.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Not at all. The Government has no right in this land.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JONES. What provision is there in case the city does not use it for park purposes? Is there a reversion clause to the Government in case it is not used?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; there is no reversion. This bill has been passed by the Senate and has been thoroughly considered by the House committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I think I will object for the time being.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

ADMINISTRATION OF GRAZING DISTRICTS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7841) relating to the administration of grazing districts.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I might say to the gentleman from Utah that he would get these bills passed if he would submit them first for consideration before he calls them up. It gives us a chance to know what the bill is about.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I appreciate what the gentleman says, and I usually do take up these matters with the gentleman, as he knows, but these were such small matters that I did not think it was necessary.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is nothing too small to be given consideration.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I appreciate that.

This bill provides that the Government, where horses are now used, can furnish forage for those horses in the Grazing Service. The same provision in other bills gives Forest Service this right, but the Grazing Service cannot do it until this bill is passed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior may require field employees of the Grazing Service to furnish horses and miscellaneous equipment necessary for the performance of their official work and may provide at Government expense forage, care, and housing for such animals and equipment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERVICE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, this will probably be my last opportunity to address the House. I was elected in 1918 and sworn in on May 19, 1919, at a special session called by President Wilson. Of the new Members who were elected to the Sixty-sixth Congress only 5 who have had continuous service are elected Members of the Seventy-eighth—DREWRY, of Virginia, LANHAM, of Texas, and REED, FISH, and CULLEN, of New York. These 5 have had 24 years' continuous service which it has been my good fortune to share with them. During that period I have served under 4 chairmen

of the Ways and Means Committee; 5 Presidents, and 7 Speakers, and to the seventh of these, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] may I say that he has presided with both grace and courtesy and has manifested a degree of firmness and fairness that has placed him on the list of our great Speakers of the House. The late William Tyler Page recently made a survey of membership for my colleague [Mr. REED] and informed him that since our service began in 1919 we had served with 1,084 Members. This illustrates the rapid changes in membership due to resignation, death, and defeat.

The House of Representatives has become the conservative branch of Congress, and while Congress is still subjected to criticism, and at times of ridicule by the news hawks this legislative arm of the Republic has never lost the confidence of the body politic, and every Member of this House who conscientiously performs his duties, is always a considerable percentage stronger than his party in his district. Years ago the sessions were shorter and the volume of work much less. Today the Congressman has a job to which most of them devote the 365 days in a year. In the wisdom of the founding fathers the term of office was made 2 years. I believe it should be 4 years. No one may hope to get rich as a result of his congressional service. While there is much talk about the so-called high salary of \$10,000 per year, the fact is that very few Members of the House have much more than one-half that amount to meet their expenses in Washington. Campaign expenses vary in different localities but on the average they take a heavy toll from a Member's income. The Federal and State income taxes alone will absorb about \$3,000 of the salary. Perhaps some critic will say that we should not think of pecuniary gain when one seeks election as a Representative in the Congress. However, the necessity of maintaining a home, and also a temporary residence in Washington, especially when a Member has a family with children of school age, is considerable of a financial problem.

I look back with satisfaction upon my 24 years of service in this House. The membership is and always has been a fine cross section of the manhood of the country. In this House there are on both sides of the aisle many men who are qualified in every way for the highest office in the land, the Presidency. I believe it would be wise to require a candidate for that high office to have served in the Congress. For many years I advocated the single term of 6 years for a President. It would do more to prevent logrolling and political connivance than any other one change in our system.

The membership of the House has representatives of industry, agriculture, art, dentistry, medicine, and surgery, the press, and the law. A great group of talented men who have earned their spurs in their particular capacity and have been chosen to represent their folks in this greatest of deliberative bodies. I am proud of my association with them over a long period of years, and I shall

cherish the memory of their friendship and cooperative effort. The decision to retire from this splendid group of legislators is never an easy one to make. It means severing old ties and friendships with many of the distinguished colleagues with whom it has been my privilege to serve. It means that you are no longer a part of the legislative arm of the Government and worst of all it means you are quickly forgotten. To be real honest and candid, one of the serious features of this severance of membership is the realization as you pass the Sergeant at Arms' door that you are "off the pay roll."

Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-seventh Congress became a war Congress as did the Sixty-fifth. Even though this coming session will carry through to the 1944 conventions it is not likely that party lines will be sharply drawn. The war must be won and to that end I know that every Member sworn in on January 6, 1943, will allow no subterfuge, political or otherwise, to impede the war program. The American doughboy will do his part and the next Congress will back him up as we have done. We have assumed tremendous obligations in this global war, and we are in duty bound to attain the goal we have designated.

It is within the range of possibilities that this war may end during your term of service in the Seventy-eighth Congress. If so you will be faced with tremendous responsibilities. The proposed making over of the world is no trifling task but I have confidence that in whatever action you are called upon to take you will not endanger the perpetuation of those basic fundamentals inherited from the founding fathers. I know that I leave the future of my country in charge of a loyal, constructive group of real Americans. I know they will not fail us.

DECISION NOT AN EASY ONE TO MAKE, CONGRESSMAN SAYS IN STATEMENT REVIEWING 24 YEARS' SERVICE TO THIRTIETH DISTRICT

Congressman Dr. FRANK CROWTHER, representing Fulton-Hamilton-Montgomery-Schenectady district in the House of Representatives for 24 years, has issued a statement in which he apparently declares his "desire to retire from public service" at the end of this year but expresses some regrets. The statement received by the Morning Herald expresses appreciation for having been able to serve in Congress and the Congressman's regrets at the severance of ties.

Congressman CROWTHER declined to run 2 years ago, but at that time he was pressed into service, rescinded his notice of retirement, and was reelected.

TEXT OF STATEMENT

Dr. CROWTHER's statement follows:

"I have entered upon the twenty-fourth year of congressional service as a Representative of the Thirtieth District, comprised of the counties of Schenectady, Montgomery, Fulton, and Hamilton. I was first elected in 1918, when we were at war, and in these closing days of my service my country is again at war. Thousands of the finest of our young manhood have either enlisted or have been called in the draft who were yet unborn when first I went to Washington as a Member of Congress. They have all gone to the front with the same basic ideal as did the boys in 1917—the preservation of the American way of life. May God grant them safe return.

"The declaration of one's desire to retire from public service is not an easy one to make. It means the severing of old friendships with the many distinguished colleagues with whom it has been my privilege to serve. It means that I shall no longer be a part of the Congress of the United States, and worst of all it means that I shall soon be forgotten."

SOME COMPENSATIONS

"However, there are compensations to offset these eventualities. I shall, as the years go on, be able to traverse the road known as Memory Lane, and I shall remember the loyalty of a great constituency that never failed in the support of my candidacy. During all the intervening years I have received hundreds of thousands of letters from you folks of this district, and many of them have been commendatory of my actions. Many that I received were couched in terms of bitter criticism, much of which I no doubt deserved, for it is not possible that a Representative should see eye to eye with a constituency that numbers nearly 240,000. After all, that also is the American way, and in public life one must accept the responsibilities, and when criticism becomes his portion he must be able to take it.

"It has been a high privilege to have served you all these years. When I was first elected in 1918, I was a comparative stranger, and 'ye took me in.' I trust that confidence has never been violated. Always a Republican, and with a well-grounded faith in the policies and traditions of my party, I have never permitted partisanship to influence my actions in the performance of my obligations to all the people of the district, and many of you who differ with me politically have been very kind and appreciative.

"To all the county chairmen and that great group of county committeemen and to the Women's Republican clubs, may I express my appreciation.

"In a recent editorial in one of my home papers, the statement was made that 'of course nobody loves a Congressman.' Perhaps that is a true statement. It may be too much for a Congressman to expect. I trust that I have so conducted myself during my term of service and that though nobody loves me, I have at least earned their respect."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a statement I made to the press of my district on my resignation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, no one more deeply regrets the voluntary retirement of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER], my personal friend and coworker over a number of years, than myself. I regret that I did not know until a few moments ago that it was his purpose to make his last address in the House this afternoon.

I have served side by side with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] on the committee of which I at present have the honor to be chairman for 18 years. I have been a member of this committee for 18 years, and he was a member when I became a member of it; he has served on this committee for 20 years, if I am not mis-

taken, 2 years longer than I; so I feel I am in a position to know something of his usefulness as a member of our committee, of the Congress, and the country.

I have never served with a man who was more loyal or more devoted to duty than the gentleman from New York; his outstanding ability, his industry, his honesty of thought and purpose, his versatility, his readiness at repartee, are hardly equaled by any man with whom I have ever been acquainted or who has served in this House since I have been a Member of it. He has attended the sessions of the committee regularly and faithfully; he expresses himself in the most apt terms; he speaks his own opinion and votes his own convictions. He has been, and is, an upstanding and an outstanding Member of this body. I deeply regret his leaving our committee, for he is a citadel of strength to any cause he espouses, I certainly has been a most active and useful member of the Committee on Ways and Means. While he is a tower of strength to any cause he espoused, I used to think when we had politics in our committee—we have not had any for so long I have almost forgotten the alphabet of politics, and of course since the war came on there has not been the slightest evidence of any political feeling in the committee, but back when we did have politics in our committee—he was a most dangerous adversary.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that men of the ability, integrity, experience, and industry, with all the qualifications of head and heart possessed by the gentleman from New York, that such men should retire from the Congress.

Dr. CROWTHER is a statesman in the finest sense and his loss will be severely felt. We are having quite a number of retirements from our committee; quite a number of changes will be made in the next session of Congress; yet there never has been a time in the history of this country when experience and real statesmanship were a greater asset or more badly needed than the present.

While I know you all share my regret at the retirement of the gentleman from New York and realize the great loss his leaving means to us all, yet I know you share with me the earnest hope and desire that in private life our good friend may by a kind Providence be given many, many years in which he and his fine wife may receive all the joys that can possibly come to anyone.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret we find our good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] is retiring from this great legislative assembly, after 24 years of efficient and able service.

I recall as if it were but yesterday when I came to Congress 18 years ago and had my first opportunity to observe the gentleman from New York in action. At that time he was in the middle of a tariff debate, and he made a deep impression

upon me as a forceful and fighting debater. I learned then what was confirmed by years of subsequent observation, that the gentleman from New York was an outstanding authority on tariff and taxation.

The gentleman from New York served the country for 24 of its most important years; he has served it efficiently, faithfully, and well. It is with keen regret we see a man of his outstanding ability retire. He has been a hard-working Member of Congress, and as he leaves for a well-earned vacation, with him goes the respect and esteem of every Member of this House.

I rise to pay this small tribute to a good American, a great public servant: As you leave, Doctor, to your new home in the far western country, you carry with you the best wishes of every one of us who has been privileged to serve with you. May the future be crowned with good health and the fullest measure of happiness.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] is recognized.

MR. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine pleasure that I embrace this opportunity to raise my voice in brief but sincere tribute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Dr. CROWTHER]. For a decade it has been my privilege to serve side by side with him as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. When the subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation of the Ways and Means Committee was first created 10 years ago he and I became members of that important subcommittee. We worked together through the years. Later it became my privilege to be chairman of that subcommittee and our pleasant association continued.

We were dealing with many difficult and perplexing problems of taxation challenging the best thought and attention that could be given, when many technical and intricate questions would be raised and discussed, we would then hear the clear voice of the gentleman from New York come forth with such sound logic and convincing statements of his convictions that it would clear away these technicalities.

He is a man of the highest character and most lofty ideals, a man of recognized ability and demonstrated devotion to the public service, and I feel that I express the true sentiments and feelings of every Member of the House and every member of our committee when I say to him as he leaves us here, he may rest assured that his genial personality, his strong character, and outstanding ability will ever remain with us a cherished memory and that he has our sincere best wishes for continued health, happiness, and prosperity.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is recognized.

MR. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this body will miss the departure of our good friend from New York, Dr. CROWTHER, more than myself. Many of you will recall that it was Dr. CROWTHER's purpose to retire voluntarily 2 years ago, but he was drafted by his constituents to again make the race.

This time he was permitted, over the objections of many of his constituents, to gratify his desire to retire to an easier life after a long and distinguished career in this body.

It is not within my ability, Mr. Speaker, to add to what has already been said about our colleague's ability, character, and geniality. For me to attempt to do so would be like gilding the lily. But I do want to say—and I say this with all the sincerity of which I am capable, that the retirement of Dr. CROWTHER from this body is a distinct personal loss to myself and to every other member of the great Ways and Means Committee. Not only will his retirement be a loss to the Ways and Means Committee but it will be a loss to the House of Representatives, to the people of the Thirtieth New York Congressional District, and to the American people.

In all of the years of my service here—and I have served with Dr. CROWTHER for 24 years of that time—I have never met one of whom I was more genuinely fond—in whose judgment I had greater confidence and whose integrity was the higher. As a matter of fact, I have never served with a man in this House whose integrity I did question. All the Members are actuated by the highest of motives and the sincerest of desires to do that which is for the best interest of our beloved country.

We shall miss Dr. CROWTHER, but he will take with him into his retirement our best wishes for happiness, good health, and length of days.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized.

MR. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I join with those gentlemen who have spoken in expressing my profound regret that our distinguished friend from New York, Dr. CROWTHER, is leaving the House of Representatives. I have been thrown with him more than any other man in Congress for the last 10 years, and I wish to speak of him as a man as well as a Representative.

He is one of the most versatile, if not the most versatile, Member of this Congress. In music, in art, and in literature he has no superior on either side of the aisle. He is a Christian gentleman, with a conscience void of offense, a man of the highest integrity, and one of the most devoted men to the fundamental principles of this Government that it has ever been my privilege to know.

Someone has said:

I wrote my name upon the sand
And trusted it would stand for aye;
But soon, alas, the reflux sea
Had washed my feeble lines away.

I carved my name upon the wood
And, after many years, returned again;
I missed the shadow of the tree
That stretched of old upon the plain.

To solid marble, next, my name
I gave as a perpetual trust;
An earthquake rent it to its base,
And now it lies, o'erlaid with dust.

All these had failed; in wiser mood
I turned and asked myself, "What then?"
If I would have my name endure,
I'll write it on the hearts of men.

FRANK CROWTHER has not only written his name upon the hearts of all the Members with whom he has served, but he has written upon the hearts of all of us with whom he has been associated on the outside—

Long, long be my heart with those memories
filled,
Like a vase in which roses have once been
distilled;
You may break, you may shatter the vase if
you will,
But the scent of the roses will hang around
it still.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER] is recognized.

MR. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, in these closing days of the Seventy-seventh Congress we look about us and see that there are many who will not be with us in the Seventy-eighth Congress. Some will be absent by reason of the exigencies and accidents of politics; and others by voluntary retirement will separate themselves from scenes which have in the past two decades become familiar to them and in which they were a vital part of the machinery of the House of Representatives in its work as a legislative body.

Among those who will be absent on account of the exigencies of politics I notice my very dear personal friend, Hon. JOHN M. HOUSTON. He belongs to an opposite political party. Once a poetic Governor of Kansas remarked that no sweeter flowers of friendship ever bloomed than those that clambered over party walls. Of course I was glad to see my other bosom friend Congressman REES elected, being a loyal Republican, but on the other hand I was heartbroken to see good old JACK HOUSTON defeated. Greater love hath no Republican. So, hail, and farewell, and may all the Democratic fairies prosper you.

As one of those who voluntarily retired, I want to pay tribute to Dr. FRANK CROWTHER who, for the past 24 years, has been a most distinguished and valuable Member of Congress from the 30th Congressional District of New York.

During his service in the House he has been one of the outstanding Members in ability and influence, and his commanding position on the Committee of Ways and Means made him a powerful factor in legislation. In the years when the tariff was a matter of contention in Congress there was no one in either the House or the Senate who spoke with more force of logic than Dr. CROWTHER. In my opinion he was by far the foremost authority on tariffs and taxes that we had in Congress. On the Republican side he was the heavy artillery in the battles of the tariff. His position was always fortified by abundant figures and conclusive facts which he presented in most forceful and convincing language. He was one of the most persuasive and effective orators in the House. His place on the Committee on Ways and Means will be difficult to fill, not alone by reason of his mastery of the subjects of taxes and revenues but also on account of his genial personality and contagious good humor which so often relieved the monotony of the discussions of serious matter-of-fact subjects.

Dr. CROWTHER will be missed by his fellow legislators who have learned to love and respect him, not only as a good lawmaker but also as a gentleman worthy of admiration in other lines of endeavor. I am very sure he is the most versatile Member of the House, though on account of his modesty and reserve many are not aware of all his attainments.

Those who have had the good fortune to see his many paintings in oil will testify that he possesses rare talent which has engaged his leisure hours. He is also an excellent musician, and his collection of rare violins has delighted his friends as well as has his music. These are hobbies with Dr. CROWTHER, and no doubt in his release from the strenuous labors as a Member of the House these diversions, which he dearly loves, will afford him many happy hours.

I know I speak the sentiment of the whole membership of this House when I say that in his retirement the House only has sincere regret in the parting of our ways, mingled with the very warmest and best wishes for his happiness and prosperity.

As Dr. CROWTHER, with many others, leaves us, we sometimes wonder why we come to Congress and whether its pleasures and opportunity for service requite us for the trouble and vexation of spirit, the fisticuff of political strife endured, and the separation from friends and firesides which our tenure here entails.

A former Congressman from Kentucky, Maurice H. Thatcher, expresses his view in verse, as follows:

A CONGRESSMAN'S LOT

A Congressman's lot! Who can portray it?
Interpret it with all-revealing art?
Hold up the scales in evenness to weigh it?
Or read the soils of which it is a part?
Damned is the Congressman for doing; for lacks
He's doubly damned. So he must learn to thrive
On curses vile, however much they tax
His fortitude; else, ne'er can he survive.
Messenger for all, his calloused feet may know
Their rest within the grave, but scarce before.
Tireless purveyor, unless his skill can show
Miracles of "loaves and fishes" how poor,
To many, seem his toils; and when life's done:
A line—a name misspelled—oblivion!

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during the journey of life we occasionally meet one who makes a profound and lasting impression upon us. One of this rare type whom I have met is our distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York, Dr. CROWTHER. For 12 years the doctor and I served on the Committee on Ways and Means. I join in everything the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] have said in relation to the outstanding service Dr. CROWTHER has rendered on that important committee.

The voluntary leaving of Dr. CROWTHER from this House is a personal loss to me, in a sense, and to all of us, because we will be denied his close association during the next Congress. The doctor and I have been close personal friends for years. I respect him officially and I value his friendship personally.

Clean, honorable, visionary, and courageous, Dr. CROWTHER is one of those men who leave a lasting impression on the minds of all who serve with them. He has been a credit to the people of the district he has represented for so many years. I know the people of his district value the high character of service he has given to them.

As we leave here, and some day each and every one of us must leave this body, we leave behind those contributions we make to the public service during the period we serve in this body and we leave here with the friendships we have made. Dr. CROWTHER leaves behind him 24 years of faithful service to country, to State, and to the people of his district, and he leaves here with the friendship of every Member of this body.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, during my 24 years in this House I have seen many splendid men come here and afterward retire to private life. Their going caused great regret in my heart because they were leaving a work in life into which they had fitted with great honor to themselves and certainly with great honor and satisfaction to those who had sent them here. I have known no man among them whose going was more untimely or whose loss to the country was greater than that of my old friend the gentleman from New York, Dr. CROWTHER.

I am one of the members of the old school. I have always believed that the progress and prosperity which have come to this country during the past 60 years have come largely because of the wisdom with which the Congress legislated in years gone by, and the courage, resourcefulness, and ingenuity of those whose vision was responsible for the greatest national development in all history. The Congress put upon the statute books laws under which protection was given to those in this country who tried and succeeded in bringing to the American people a degree of progress and prosperity that outshone that of any other nation in all the world. I have always believed that the American producer was entitled to the American market so far as he could reasonably supply that market. That was, and I believe still is, good Republican doctrine. My grandfather was "under the oaks" at Jackson, Mich., when the Republican Party was formed, and I have been a disciple of the beliefs of that party since that time. Perhaps I can give you a little clearer picture of just what my ideas have been when I tell you that the only two men in the House of Representatives who have served here with me who talked my language in this respect have

been Uncle Joe Fordney, of Michigan, and the gentleman from New York, Dr. CROWTHER.

You can imagine my regret that the latter is leaving this House at this time. I say this because I realize, as I think many other Members on both sides of the House realize, that when this war is over and peace again comes to this sorely troubled world the Congress will be faced with problems such as we have never faced before. When that time comes, the wisdom and the courage of this Congress will determine whether or not this land is to go down the years as a great land of opportunity for those who live among us, and whether to those who live elsewhere throughout the world it shall remain the land of hope it has been in the past.

For many years I have given to the gentleman from New York, Dr. FRANK CROWTHER my affection, my confidence, my great respect. My regret at his leaving Congress voluntarily is heightened by the knowledge that when the time comes of which I speak the gentleman from New York, Dr. CROWTHER, will no longer be here to give us the benefit of his great wisdom and his sound advice.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, while I regret as deeply as any Member of this House the fact that Dr. CROWTHER is voluntarily leaving Congress, yet I am not one of those who feel particularly depressed. This is not a funeral at all. Do not think for a moment that FRANK CROWTHER is not the same old hard-hitting man we have known, for he is. He is now Congressman emeritus. He is on his sabbatical leave. You don't know the man as I know him. He is going out into another State. He has already represented two States in legislative bodies. The first you know, he will be back here, probably over in the Senate. He has all kinds of fight in him yet. I do not think there is a man on the floor of this House who has the forensic hitting power and fight of FRANK CROWTHER right now. He comes from that old stock that lived 9 days after their heads were cut off. He is going to live on, fight on as an inspiration to all of us. You remember that story of the city clerk in Massachusetts who held office for 50 years. Finally he was replaced by another clerk. Some of his friends went to him and said, "What do you think about it?" He replied, "Well, I did not expect the job would be permanent when I took it."

FRANK CROWTHER has been here for 24 years, and I tell you that we as Americans are proud of the splendid record that he has made. It is an outstanding, constructive record of real statesmanship. Our distinguished colleague has earned the right to a vacation. But, as I say, he will be back again. He has always stood for the Constitution. He always believed in and on all occasions he has fought for the preservation of the Bill of Rights, and he will do so as long as he lives. I will guarantee that after he goes into that western country he will visit the schools and colleges of that beauti-

ful region and in his forceful manner tell the young people what the Constitution and the Bill of Rights means to them as future citizens of this great Republic. The situation there will not be as it was in a college in New York City where a teacher addressed a class of 200 youths, and asked that those who were Communists to step to the other side of the room. They all stepped across the aisle to the Communist side except two. When FRANK CROWTHER gets through with a group of youngsters there will not be one of them who will be lining up on the Communistic side. He is going to do a great work in the future for his country as he has in the past. I join with the Members of the House in wishing him health, happiness, prosperity, and Godspeed.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of deep personal regret that the gentleman from New York, FRANK CROWTHER, one of my closest personal and political friends, has decided to leave the House of Representatives. In the many years that we have served together in the Congress I have not met a single Member who surpassed him in ability, in high character, in lofty ideals, and in out-and-out Americanism. He was born in England and came over to this country as a youngster. If he has committed any errors of judgment, it is because he loved his adopted country too much and not too little. We in this House, knowing the gentleman from New York, FRANK CROWTHER, as we do, and his distinguished services, realize that we are about to lose one of our finest and ablest Members. He is leaving of his own accord, and we wish him well and hope that he will continue to take an interest in the affairs of his adopted country and help fight its battles and our battles as he has done in the House of Representatives over many years of useful and faithful service. He has been a credit to his district, to the State of New York, to the party he belongs to, and to the Congress of the United States. Well done, thou good and faithful public servant.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Edward Tomlinson on the importance of our relations to Central and South American republics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TRAYNOR and Mr. JONKMAN were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by Richard Neuberger.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative matters have been disposed of and any other special orders I may be given 25 minutes to address the House on tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the legislative business on Wednesday I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert a very timely editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement by Mr. Wanglie, of Minneapolis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from the Benton County (Iowa) U. S. D. A. War Board.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative calendar on tomorrow and any other special orders that have been entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and to include some excerpts in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting a speech which I delivered at the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco on December 4.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from Southern California Business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and

include certain quotations from President Taft and others.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a recent radio speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by John O'Connor, president of Montgomery Ward & Co., with reference to the National Labor Relations Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] be allowed to extend his own remarks by inserting an address delivered by Hon. GEORGE H. BENDER.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. PLUMLEY] be allowed to extend his remarks by including an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. BALDWIN] be allowed to extend his remarks by inserting an article appearing in the Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the payment of subsidies to keep prices of commodities under fixed or ceiling prices, so as to prevent inflationary conditions, is a problem that ought to have the immediate study and attention of this Congress. We ought to be informed how far the administration intends to carry this policy. To whom and to what extent is it to be applied?

It appears that when goods are not, or cannot, be delivered within fixed prices a subsidy is paid from the Federal Treasury in order to get them moving. I am advised, for example, the Government is paying subsidies of a million dollars a month so milk can be delivered at ceiling prices in New York and vicinity. The money comes out of emergency

funds of the Treasury. A subsidy of 3 or 4 cents a pound is about to be paid to produce certain kinds of cheese at ceiling prices.

Just recently flour millers have appealed to the Office of Price Administration, insisting they cannot possibly continue to deliver flour at present ceiling prices and buy wheat on the market, which, by the way, is about 78 or 80 percent of parity. Subsidies are not yet being paid the millers but are suggested.

Meat packers are protesting. They say they cannot continue to fill the demands for meat on the margin left for them under ceiling prices. Payment of Federal subsidies has recently been under consideration.

Lumber producers are appealing for some kind of assistance in order to carry on.

Mr. Speaker, many other examples could be cited. My purpose is to direct attention to an important situation that should be carefully examined.

Payment of subsidies from the Federal Treasury is not new. But to do it to keep prices in line could cause a complicated situation and could defeat the purpose for which it was intended, unless it, at least, is carefully controlled and guarded.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] may be permitted to file a supplemental report to report No. 2726, accompanying H. R. 7463, to comply with the Ramseyer rule.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII—PAYMENT FOR WHARF USAGE BY UNITED STATES

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7514) to authorize payment by the departments and agencies of the United States, notwithstanding section 89 of the act of April 30, 1900—Thirty-first United States Reports, page 141—for the use, during a limited period, of certain wharves of the Territory of Hawaii.

I have conferred with the majority and minority leaders and with the ranking members of the Committee on Territories. They have no objection to my calling this matter up at this time.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. KING. The purpose of the bill is to permit agencies of the United States Government to pay for the use of Territorial wharves in the Territory of Hawaii, such wharves as were in existence at the time of the annexation of Hawaii. It has the approval of the War Department, the Navy Department, the War Shipping Board and the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is the only way the Territory can get revenue now?

Mr. KING. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Because, as things stand today, the United States Government is the only one using the wharves.

Mr. KING. Yes; and unless payment is made for their use, there will be no way of servicing the Territorial bonds issued on the collateral of Territorial property.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provision of section 89 of the act of Congress approved April 30, 1900, that "no tolls or charges shall be made by the government of the Territory of Hawaii for the use of any such property by the United States, or by any vessel of war, tug, revenue cutter, or other boat or transport in the service of the United States," the departments and agencies of the United States are authorized to pay to the Territory of Hawaii, the reasonable value, as determined by the department or agency concerned, of such use during the period commencing on January 1, 1942, and ending, unless Congress shall fix an earlier date, 6 months after the termination of the present war.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the Record a letter regarding our colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. YOUNG, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, and Mr. BENDER asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an article from the Architectural Forum and one from the Engineering News Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an outline of a plan to promote and enforce world peace, written in 1923.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a short statement by Dr. George E. Benson.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two requests: One, to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein a letter written to me by Lt. Richard L. Neuberger of the United States Army, concerning the opening of the highway to Alaska; and the other to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein an address by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, read at the official ceremony incident to the opening of the Alaskan highway.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on the relative output of British and American shipyard workers and to include a letter from the Chairman of the Maritime Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include an address I made to the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on two subjects, in the first to include two short editorials and two short news items with reference to a refund of 15 percent on electric charges by the town of Athens, Ala., and, second, to include in my remarks a brief address that I made recently to the National Interfraternity Conference in New York, and also an editorial from the Birmingham News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

MEETING OF THE FIRST SESSION SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a joint resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 368), as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution fixing the dates of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress and of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress," approved January 2, 1942, is amended by striking out "Monday, January 4, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "Wednesday, January 6, 1943."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE JOSEPH F. O'CONNELL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much to announce to the House the death on Thursday last of a former distinguished Member of this body, Joseph F. O'Connell, of Boston. Mr. O'Connell was one of my predecessors, representing my district with outstanding distinction in this body from 1907 to 1911, inclusive.

A man of great mental capacity, he utilized his unusual abilities in a constructive manner in the service of mankind. Mr. O'Connell lived an active life up to the time of his unexpected and unfortunate death. Everyone in Boston knew "Joe" O'Connell, as he was lovingly called, and everyone respected and admired him for the fine life he led, an inspiration and an example for all to follow.

Only a few nights before his sudden death, a number of his friends, on his birthday anniversary, tendered him a testimonial dinner. I was not able to attend. In a message to those gathered on that occasion, I said:

Mr. O'Connell is trusted, because he is trustworthy; he is honored, because he is honorable.

What finer reputation can anyone possess than to be trusted and honored by his fellow men. Such a reputation is earned, not purchased.

"Joe" O'Connell enjoyed such a reputation because he earned it as a result of a lifetime of able, honorable, sincere, and constructive service as a legislator, a public official in other fields of public activity, and as a lawyer. He earned it as a fine family man.

His death, and particularly so at this time, when our country is engaged in a war of survival, when men of his extraordinary ability and strong patriotism are needed, constitutes an irreparable loss to the Nation, to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and to the city of Boston, all of which he has so faithfully served in the past.

The passing on of my late friend leaves a vacant space that will be hard to fill.

I join with his many friends in extending to Mrs. O'Connell, whose late father also was a distinguished Member of this body, having represented some years ago the Wilkes-Barre District of Pennsylvania in Congress, and her children, six of whom are now members of our armed forces, my profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the majority leader and others as to the program for the remainder of the week? May I ask, if it is appropriate, that a statement be made to the House at this time on that subject?

Mr. McCORMACK. The only legislation that can be passed is by unanimous consent. I am hopeful that a resolution to adjourn sine die will be acted upon by both branches effective next Wednesday. If not on Wednesday, I am strongly hopeful that it will be some day this week.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman.

RESIGNATION OF A. F. MACIEJEWSKI AS MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Springfield, December 9, 1942.

Hon. SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I wish to inform you that I have accepted the resignation of A. F. MACIEJEWSKI, Representative in Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Illinois, effective as of December 8, 1942.

Respectfully,

DWIGHT H. GREEN, Governor.

RESIGNATION OF HARRY P. BEAM AS MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Springfield, December 9, 1942.

Hon. SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I wish to inform you that I have accepted the resignation of HARRY P. BEAM, Representative in Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Illinois, effective as of December 6, 1942.

Respectfully,

DWIGHT H. GREEN, Governor.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—SEVENTH QUARTERLY REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER LEND-LEASE ACT (H. DOC. NO. 904)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and with accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the seventh quarterly report on operations under the Lend-Lease Act.

Since the last report, the war has entered a new phase. United Nations' forces attacking from Egypt and North Africa are contesting with the Axis for control of the African coast line of the Mediterranean. The Soviet Army, having held with stubborn bravery at Stalingrad, has now assumed the offensive. The Japanese have been recklessly expending ships and men in the Solomons, a battleground of our own choosing.

The Axis Powers have, temporarily at least, lost the initiative. We must do all we can to keep them from regaining it.

We must bring the full strength of all the United Nations to bear directly against the enemy. We must bring together our joint productive capacity and our material resources, our finished munitions and our fighting manpower; and we must do this in accordance with a single world strategy. That we are making good progress in this direction I think is shown by recent developments, and by this report on the part played by lend-lease.

We also have another task, which will grow in magnitude as our striking power grows, and as new territories are liberated from the enemy's crushing grip. The task is to supply medicines, food, clothing, and other dire needs of those peoples who have been plundered, despoiled, and starved.

The Nazis and Japanese have butchered innocent men and women in a campaign of organized terror. They have stripped the lands they hold of food and other resources. They have used hunger as an instrument of the slavery they seek to impose.

Our policy is the direct opposite. United Nations' forces will bring food for the starving and medicine for the sick. Every aid possible will be given to restore each of the liberated countries to soundness and strength, so that each may make its full contribution to the United Nations' victory, and to the peace which follows.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
THE WHITE HOUSE, December 11, 1942.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—SPENCER MEEKS (H. DOC. NO. 900)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, a bill (H. R. 6545) for the relief of Spencer Meeks.

The bill proposes to pay the sum of \$5,000 to Spencer Meeks, of 3901 Jefferson Street, Savannah, Ga., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained on May 9, 1941, when he was struck by a bullet fired from a pistol range of the Savannah, Ga., air base of the United States Army Air Force.

It appears that on May 9, 1941, test firing with a 30-caliber aircraft machine gun on an improvised pipe mount, to determine the suitability of this type of mount for ground defense of airdromes, was being conducted on the police range near the southwest end of the air field at the Savannah Army Air Base, Savannah, Ga. An Army officer was in charge of the tests and had selected the range to be used. At about the same time Spencer Meeks, a car repairer in the employ of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., while working at a bench in the shops of that company, located at a distance of about a mile from the range and in the general direction of fire, was

struck just below the left elbow by a missile, later identified as a 30-caliber projectile, which entered the room through a window.

As a result of the accident, Mr. Meeks, a left-handed man, 51 years of age, sustained a cut in the elbow of his left arm, together with a fracture of the radius bone at the point of the elbow joint. Medical evidence of record indicates that up to December 30, 1941, Mr. Meeks was unable to fully extend his elbow joint and was able only to flex the wrist joint to a 45-degree angle compared with a 90-degree angle for a normal joint, and that 50 percent of the power in his grasp had been lost.

While I favor payment to Mr. Meeks of compensation commensurate with the injury he has sustained due to negligence of the military forces, and through no fault of his own, it seems to me that the proposed payment of \$5,000 is excessive. I am informed that a workman eligible to the benefits of the Longshoremen's Act for a similar injury and permanent partial disability equivalent to 50 percent loss of use of an arm would be entitled to compensation in the aggregate amount of \$3,475.

Attention is also called to the fact that the Congress has recently enacted, and I have approved, a bill (H. R. 7149), for the relief of David E. Clark, a farmer 48 years of age, which provided compensation in the amount of \$3,713.50. The claimant in that case had been shot by the recklessness of Army troops and the bullet had passed entirely through his body near his heart, having punctured his lungs and fractured two of his ribs. The medical evidence showed that Mr. Clark was incapacitated permanently to the extent of approximately 50 percent.

I regret, therefore, that I do not feel justified in approving the bill, but I would be glad to approve a measure which would provide compensation to Mr. Meeks more commensurate with the injury sustained by him.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 14, 1942.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—LORRAINE NOVAK (H. DOC. NO. 901)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, the bill (H. R. 6781) for the relief

of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor.

The bill proposed to pay the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor, of New York, New York, the sum of \$4,500 in settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by Lorraine Novak when she was burned by steam on January 28, 1942, as the result of project operations of the Work Projects Administration.

The accident resulted when a rubber hose, used to convey hot water from a heater to a concrete mixer, slipped from a pipe connection on the heater, causing hot water and steam to be sprayed over the area surrounding the mixer and upon Lorraine Novak, a child 4½ years of age, who was standing nearby on the sidewalk.

It appears that, as a result of the accident, Lorraine sustained severe second- and third-degree burns of the forehead, right side of face and ear, back of neck and right scalp. The attending physician states that the burns have healed, leaving scars which may be removed by plastic operations when the child reaches the age of 18. The cost of these operations and expenses instant thereto will run between \$1,500 and \$2,000. Medical expenses already incurred have amounted to only \$60.

From the above it appears that the bill provides for the payment of the sum of \$2,440 or more, depending on future expenses, as compensation for pain and suffering which, while I have full sympathy for the child in the injuries she has sustained, I consider somewhat excessive. It may be noted that under the Federal Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, benefits for serious facial or head disfigurement may not exceed \$3,500, which maximum payment includes loss of earnings. In the instant case, however, there was no loss of earnings. I would be glad to approve the bill which would provide payment, in this case, of an amount more commensurate with the injuries sustained.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 14, 1942.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—L. W. COLLINS (H. DOC. NO. 902)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, a bill (H. R. 1675) for the relief of L. W. Collins.

This bill would authorize and direct the Comptroller General of the United States to credit the account of L. W. Collins, former superintendent of Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the amount of \$13,241.64, representing expenditures made by him while performing his duties as such superintendent.

While credit in the amount carried in the enrolled enactment was originally disallowed in the official accounts of Mr. Collins, there has since been collected by the Department of Justice, under a compromise agreement with Mr. Collins and his surety, the sum of \$9,527.58 in full settlement of the Government's claim. I am advised, therefore, by the Comptroller General that since there are no disallowances against the accounts of Mr. Collins, the enactment of this bill would accomplish no purpose. In this circumstance, I feel constrained to withhold my approval of the bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 14, 1942.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—EDWARD GILLEN DOCK, DREDGE & CONSTRUCTION CO. (H. DOC. NO. 899)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, the bill (H. R. 3468) for the relief of the Edward Gillen Dock, Dredge & Construction Co.

Several years ago, the United States acquired by condemnation proceedings certain property belonging to the Chautauqua Drainage and Levee District, in Mason County, Ill., for the purpose of converting the property into a wildlife preserve. The issue as to the amount of just compensation which the Government should pay for the property was litigated in court, and the amount judicially determined to be the fair value of the property was paid by the United States.

Some time previously to the acquisition of the property by the Government, the Edward Gillen Dock, Dredge & Construction Co., pursuant to a contract with the drainage district, constructed a levee on the property. The district paid to the Edward Gillen Dock, Dredge & Construction Co. part of the amount due to the latter under the contract, but a balance of \$30,146.32 remained due and unpaid. The present bill would provide for the payment of this amount by the United States to the Edward Gillen Dock, Dredge & Construction Co. It is clear that in paying the just compensation awarded by the court upon the taking of the property in question, the United States discharged its legal and moral obligation in respect to it. No sufficient reason appears for making any additional payment to any other person. While it is to be regretted that the Edward Gillen Dock, Dredge & Construction Co. has not received from the drainage district all of the money that was owing to it, this circumstance does not constitute a proper reason for the Government assuming the indebtedness in addition to the liability to pay just com-

pensation, which it has already dispensed.

In the light of the foregoing considerations, I regret that I am constrained to return the bill without my approval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 14, 1942.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—JOHN L. ALCOCK (H. DOC. NO. 903)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3773, a bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of John L. Alcock.

It appears from Government records that between May 1917 and February 1918, John L. Alcock, of Baltimore, Md., entered into contracts with certain lumber brokers in Scotland for the sale and delivery to them of a large quantity of spruce and fir lumber to be shipped from the United States. In turn he entered into contracts with certain lumber companies in Oregon, by which the latter agreed to sell and deliver to him certain spruce and fir lumber, it being his purpose to use the lumber to be so purchased by him for delivery against his contracts in Scotland.

Prior to February 18, 1918, part of this lumber was on railroad cars, either at Baltimore, or on the way to that city, pursuant to contracts made by Mr. Alcock with the lumber concerns in Oregon. There were 301 cars in all. On February 18, 1918, the War Department delivered to Mr. Alcock a priority certificate directing this lumber to be delivered at the direction of the Signal Corps. The latter ordered the shipments to be diverted and delivered to the Governments of Great Britain, France, and Italy.

The remainder of the lumber purchased by Mr. Alcock for the purpose of fulfilling his contracts abroad had not as yet been shipped, but had been contracted for. In April 1918 the War Department directed Mr. Alcock's suppliers to cancel his contracts and to discontinue shipments to him. This was done.

Subsequently, Mr. Alcock brought suit against the United States in respect to the lumber loaded in the 301 cars above-mentioned, to recover the difference between the market value of the lumber and the amount actually received by him from the foreign governments, the theory of the suit being that the lumber had been commandeered by the United States. After a trial the petition was dismissed on the merits on the ground that there had been no commandeering in fact.

On May 28, 1928, an act of Congress became law which conferred jurisdiction

on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of J. L. Alcock for losses or damages, if any, which he may have suffered through the action by Government agencies in commandeering, requisitioning, controlling by compulsion or otherwise allocating or directing, the contracting for, or delivery of lumber which he owned or had sold. After trial on the merits, the court rendered judgment in favor of the plaintiff for the sum of \$163,247.17 with interest at 6 percent for a period of over 14 years. This amount constituted the difference between the price for which Mr. Alcock had agreed to sell the lumber to his customers in Scotland, and the amount which he actually received therefor from Great Britain, France, and Italy.

Mr. Alcock also claimed that he was entitled to recover the profit that he would have realized on the resale of the remaining lumber which had not been shipped to him by his suppliers as a result of the above-mentioned War Department orders directing a cancellation of the contracts between Mr. Alcock and his suppliers. The court held, however, that Mr. Alcock was not entitled to recover on this item.

The purpose of the bill under consideration is to confer on the Court of Claims jurisdiction to render judgment on the last-mentioned item of the claim, which amounts to the sum of approximately \$195,000. It contains a direction that the Court of Claims should measure the losses and damages, if any, sustained by Mr. Alcock by the difference between what he would have received from the foreign purchasers on delivery of the lumber f. o. b. cars at the mills, and the amount he had agreed to pay the American mills f. o. b. cars at mills.

It will be observed that what the claimant seeks to recover is the profit he would have realized on a resale of the lumber had he been able to secure the lumber from his suppliers, and had he been able to deliver it to his customers in Scotland. It appears to be the theory of the legislation that the Government should be held liable merely because it requisitioned the lumber in the hands of Mr. Alcock's suppliers and thereby presumably rendered it impossible for them to fulfill their obligations to Mr. Alcock. In the conduct of war, however, the Government is frequently constrained to requisition and allocate material. In case it requisitions material, it pays just compensation. There is neither a legal nor a moral obligation on its part, however, to reimburse persons who would have purchased the material so requisitioned and would have realized profits on its resale.

Moreover, it should be observed that the approval of this bill may create an undesirable precedent for numberless similar bills in behalf of individuals whose contracts have been or may be frustrated during the present war by reason of requisitioning of materials from their suppliers, priorities, and allocations. The limitless financial burden that would result is one that the Government should not in equity and good conscience be required to undertake.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 14, 1942.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the Civil Service:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, December 11, 1942.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

SIR: The Government of the United States, which is the largest single employer in the Nation, has permitted a condition to develop regarding rates of pay, hours of work, and overtime compensation, for its civilian employees, which is grossly unfair, is one of the major causes of needlessly high personnel turn-over, and is impeding the successful prosecution of the war effort. This condition may be summarized briefly as follows:

(a) The pay rates for most mechanics, tradesmen, and laborers in navy yards, arsenals, and other production establishments of the Government are fixed and adjusted to correspond with prevailing wage rates for similar work outside the Government service in the same locality. These pay rates have kept pace with the increases in wages which have occurred in private industry; hours of work for these groups have generally been set at a minimum of 48 per week, and the earnings of these employees have been further increased through the receipt of overtime compensation at time and one-half rates for work in excess of 40 hours per week. The situation with respect to these employees corresponds with that pertaining to industrial employees and represents a satisfactory condition which requires no change.

(b) The pay rates for the positions held by most salaried employees—clerical workers, postal employees, hospital attendants, professional, scientific, technical, and administrative employees—are generally fixed by statute and cannot be adjusted by any administrative action. Except for recent increases in the rates of pay for custodial employees, the last general readjustment of salary rates occurred in the 1928 and 1930 amendments to the Classification Act and in 1925 insofar as the Postal Service is concerned. The workweek for these types of employees has been extended to 43 hours in the War and Navy Departments and to 44 hours in other departments and agencies, with the exception of the Postal Service, where the amount of overtime varies with the volume of work in each locality. The Government service would generally have been placed on a 48-hour week, except for the existence of the Saturday half-holiday law, which has already been suspended insofar as the War and Navy Departments are concerned, but still requires in other agencies of the Government compensatory

time off for work in excess of 4 hours on Saturday.

(c) In four agencies of the Government, namely, the War Department, Navy Department, Maritime Commission, and National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, specific legislative authority has been granted to pay overtime compensation to certain groups of these salaried employees for work in excess of 40 hours per week. But other employees in the same agencies and in other agencies of the Government performing similar work, whose hours of duty have been lengthened beyond the peacetime work-week of 39 or 40 hours, cannot be paid overtime. This is a complete violation of the principle of equal pay for equal work, which has been the guiding policy in Federal pay matters since the enactment of the Classification Act in 1923. The authority for the payment of this type of overtime compensation to groups in the War and Navy Departments expired on June 30, 1942, and has since been twice extended by joint resolution, the last extension expiring on November 30, 1942.

I approved these extensions of existing authority to pay overtime compensations to limited groups notwithstanding the gross unfairness and inequalities which this condition created, because the Congress had been considering various means of solving this urgent and complicated pay problem. I felt that by approving these extensions of overtime compensation authorization, opportunity would be afforded to arrive at an equitable solution which would meet the needs of the Government service and of the employees involved.

It is my judgment that any further temporary extension of this authorization to pay overtime to limited groups of employees is only perpetuating a bad situation and should be avoided. However, it can be avoided only by immediate action on the part of the Congress to deal realistically with this entire problem. Unless immediate action is taken, hundreds of thousands of employees in the War and Navy Departments will suffer a severe cut in earnings for the first half of December because of the stoppage in the payment of their overtime compensation.

I realize that the enactment of an adequate solution to the problem presents difficulties. I am not wedded to any particular formula for its solution. But I feel the problem is so urgent that unless the Congress is able to arrive at a solution within the next few days, legislation should be enacted that would delegate to the Chief Executive authority to deal with problems of wage and salary rates, hours of work, and overtime compensation within the Federal service, during the war period or until such time as Congress may otherwise provide.

I am sending an identical letter to the President of the Senate.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under special orders heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] for 25 minutes.

PRESENT-DAY DANGERS TO OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this is probably one of the last times I shall address the House of Representatives as a Member, and I ask the indulgence of the Members that I may proceed without interruption at least until I have consumed the major part of the time which has been allotted to me today.

It seems only a short time since that Monday, December 1, 1930, when, with 12 others, I approached the rostrum to take the oath of office as the successor to the Honorable Edgar R. Kiess, who had served his district and State in this body with distinction for more than 17 years. Incidentally, I am the last of that group of 13 to retire from this august body.

As you all know, I was not a candidate, either in the primary or the recent election. But my retirement from this body in no way shall abate my interest in, and concern for, the future of the United States.

During my several terms in this body, I have served under six Speakers—great Americans all. I shall always cherish my association with each of them, as well as the membership of the House during those years.

Likewise, during the years I have been with you I have come to the conclusion that the membership of this body represents a fair cross-section of the American people, and that the actions taken here have almost without exception reflected a cross-section of American public opinion.

With this thought before you, I now approach near to the subject matter of this, my last appeal to you and the people.

When I became a Member more than 12 years ago, our country was in the beginning of an economic cycle called a depression.

In 1930 there were less than 550,000 employees on the Federal pay rolls, the annual appropriations were running around \$4,750,000,000 a year, and being reduced, while the national debt was only \$16,187,000,000.

In view of the situation today, with over 2,600,000 Federal employees, and the national debt over \$100,000,000,000, I feel that I have been justified in the past in propounding the question, Where are you going to get the money? You can see from the pile of Government statements on the table that I have watched it grow each day in debt.

Today I recall with a great deal of satisfaction my service with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON] and the eloquent gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], and Sam Pettengill, of Indiana, and Stafford, of Wisconsin, of the special committee appointed pursuant to House Resolution 235, to investigate Government competition with private enterprise, Seventy-second Congress.

The investigations which these gentlemen conducted and the report which they submitted, in the light of subsequent events, has become both a historic and prophetic document.

I say this because it was none other than the distinguished legislator from Georgia who declared:

We have gone so far with the policy of undermining the economic foundations upon which this country was founded and builded that we are in great danger of social disturbances of the first magnitude.

Mr. Speaker, the danger that was apparent to the gentleman from Georgia in 1933 is no less apparent today.

In 1932 the Democratic Party platform contained the following plank:

We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government, and we call upon the Democratic Party in the States to make a zealous effort to achieve a proportionate result.

This plank was endorsed by the candidate in his address of October 19, 1932, at Pittsburgh, in which he said:

I shall approach the problem of carrying out the plain precept of our party, which is to reduce the cost of current Federal Government operations by 25 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the record will show that I have been a consistent advocate of economy in Government, and that, as an expression of my attitude, I introduced as an economy measure the bill H. R. 4711 on December 8, 1931, which was to reduce by 10 percent the salaries, pay, and wages received from the United States during the calendar year 1932.

When I look back over the past 10 years, I am moved to reflect what little confidence we can put in campaign promises, or, for that matter, in party platforms.

As I think of all the new agencies we have created, of all the bureaus and commissions that have been piled upon an already overloaded Government, when it was assured to the people it would be otherwise, I sometimes wonder that this Government and particularly this Congress has survived. Never before in history, Mr. Speaker, has any government anywhere in the world stood up under so many assaults, both from within and without, as has this Republic during the past 10 years.

For 10 years an army of alien-minded internationalists, crackpots, and intellectual visionaries have been trying to remake the American pattern of life.

For 10 years they have attempted to hybridize our constitutional form of government.

They have sought to invade the legislative field of the Congress through the medium of Executive orders and administrative procedures. An overstuffed army of bureaucrats has descended upon Washington and government has become a hodgepodge of conflict enmeshed in procedural red tape that only quick and courageous action by the next Congress can end.

Today I do not chide you for the past, but I do appeal to you for the future of our country. This is not a partisan appeal. It is an American appeal to save our Constitution, to save our American way of life, to save our homes, our schools, our institutions from the hy-

bridging process, that has already gone too far for the safety of America.

The danger to our institutions lies not alone in the almost overwhelming national debt, which before this war ends may reach the stupendous total of \$300,000,000,000, but in the uses to which much of the money we have appropriated has been put. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that aside from winning this war, upon which we are all united, there is but one single issue confronting this Nation today. I shall speak boldly and frankly. That issue is a choice, on the one hand, between our own republican form of government based upon economic nationalism, States' rights, self-sufficiency, with the guaranty of the maximum enjoyment of individual liberty and freedom of initiative, or, on the other hand, some polyglot form of government, semicomunistic in style, with economic internationalism as its goal and the initiative and liberties of the people curbed by some form of bureaucratic dictatorship.

This issue is not a complicated one, but is made so to appear by the skillful maneuvering of those who would betray this Nation and deliver its people up to some world's supergovernment.

The proponents of an international policy are not without friends in the present administration or among some of the people who still believe the United States is but an outpost of some foreign government.

This, in my opinion, is the next issue which will confront the American people and the Congress.

You will surely be called to task by the people if funds are voted to continue any adventures into the international field of social or governmental economics that do not have as their first objective the preservation of ideals purely American.

In the years that have passed, the proponents of economic internationalism have used recurring crises and emergencies as the springboard for their activities. Their speakers have taken the rostrum at every opportunity to promote their cause.

Now they use the present world conflict as a cover-all for their activities. Organizations, here and abroad, are planning a new world order, not only for our own people, but for the peoples of other lands, who have, insofar as I have been able to discover, not been consulted in the matter.

Almost every day in the press, and in the handouts from various governmental agencies we find indications of a great force active in this Nation, working to undermine the ideals upon which our Government was founded.

Under a war economy, we all willingly submit to certain sacrifices and certain restrictions. We will share our food, and willingly, with those who join with us to combat the common enemy. No one worthy of the name American can do less.

But when it comes to clasping to our breasts and adopting as our own any alienism ideals, I can assure you, gentlemen of the Congress, that the American people will resist.

This "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" will not succumb without a desperate struggle on the part of those who believe in government by law and equal justice under law.

THE ASSAULT UPON STATE RIGHTS

During the years in which the assaults against our Government have been carried forward, there has also developed an assault against State rights, against American industry, and against American labor.

Federal bureaucrats by the thousands have invaded the States to impose rules and restrictions upon the farmer, the producer, the middleman, and the consumer.

Agriculture has been regimented, industry has been reviled and discouraged and the people in general have been encouraged in an attitude of futility to any resistance to the new order.

Labor, too, has received its share of attention by the planners of this new order. Today, in some communities, the right to work in certain trades and industries is entirely dependent upon the conditions laid down either by a governmental bureau or a labor union.

ASSAULT UPON THE INDIVIDUAL

Besides the assaults upon the Government, and upon the States, the rights of the individual have likewise been subject to assault from many directions.

We are rapidly moving into an epoch where every citizen must be a conformist to the "master plan" devised by the Washington bureaucrats for the new order.

Permits, licenses, and other what-nots are being superimposed upon the business and economic system of the Nation.

From Washington a constant barrage of propaganda is directed at the people through the medium of the press, the radio, and the motion-picture industry.

The channels of public information are so clogged with propaganda, that truth and information become difficult to distinguish or recognize. But through all the propaganda there is a pattern of policy that spells disaster for our form of government and our concept of human relations.

Against this propaganda there is only one defense and that is an informed citizenry devoted to the maintenance of the "four freedoms" here at home.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

On Thursday, December 9, the Department of Commerce announced the net indebtedness of individuals, business firms, and government in the United States totaled more than \$135,000,000,000 at the close of 1941. Of this total, more than \$120,000,000,000 represented private debt, while the remainder constituted obligations of Federal, State, and local government.

With the Federal debt now over \$100,000,000,000, it is my opinion that the net indebtedness of individuals, business firms, and government at the end of the present calendar year will be close to or over \$250,000,000,000.

Debts have always been, and always will be, a threat that portends human and economic slavery.

Debts in the past have also been the tools of dictatorship.

We are approaching the danger mark in our debt structure.

Therefore, sound fiscal management becomes imperative in the days that lie ahead. This debt problem has been a cause of worry to many of our truly great men. Thomas Jefferson in the third year of his first term wrote:

We are endeavoring to induce the Government to the practice of a rigorous economy to avoid burdening the people and arming the magistrate with a patronage of money which might be used to corrupt the principles of government.

To James Monroe, in 1791, he wrote:

We are ruined if we do not overrule the principle "the more we owe the more prosperous we shall be"; "that the public debt furnishes the means of enterprise"; "that if ours should be paid off, we would incur another by any means, however extravagant."

Again, in 1802, as President Jefferson wrote:

If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under pretense of taking care of them, they must become happy.

And in the declining years of his life Jefferson wrote to his friend Lafayette, in 1823:

A rigid economy of the public contributions and early interdiction of all useless expenses will go far toward keeping the Government honest and unoppressive.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that for nearly 10 years this Government has been wasting the labors of the people in many ways. The folly of this wasting is now apparent. We are, thank God, about to mend our ways. We are going to cut the appropriations to the bone, and even part of the bone itself, if I have correctly interpreted the substance of an interview with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee as reported in the press. This is a salutary promise. It bespeaks an awakening to a dangerous situation. I trust that the next Congress will make right and proper appropriations for the national defense and the war, but that they will turn a deaf ear to every appeal from the boondogglers, the wasters, and the "lecherous" group who have affixed themselves to the Government pay rolls in the past, as well as political parasites.

A fine start could be made, may I suggest, by weeding out the thousands of publicity men and information specialists now operating the Office of War Information, and turning this function over to the gentlemen of the press, who, I believe, are still capable of digging up and interpreting the news for the people.

We might also in good conscience discontinue the services of many of those now on the Federal pay rolls who are busy planning the new economic order for the world after the war is over. This advance planning for others may back-lash in a way totally unexpected.

It is a dangerous policy and should be abandoned.

In taking the floor today to address you, my remarks are not directed at any individual or any political party.

My thoughts are for your country and my country, and it is with that thought in mind I speak.

During the years here I have come to a better understanding of human life and human desires. I have also come to a realization that what we do here today may affect the lives, the hopes, the aspirations of future generations.

So, in concluding my remarks, I shall quote the words of Daniel Webster in his matchless eulogy on George Washington, delivered in 1832, wherein he said:

Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests.

It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government?

Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?

Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity?

No; if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and melancholy immortality. Bitter tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art, for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty.

This is my farewell message to you, my colleagues. May God give you who will return next year the wisdom and strength to carry on in the spirit of the founding fathers. Quite appropriately, in keeping with the season, I wish you each and every one a merry Christmas, a happy new year, and may God bless and protect you, one and all.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I rise to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I think I voice the sentiments of all of us in this House, that we are very sorry to see him leave. We may have differed with him on occasion, but no one ever questioned his courage, his integrity, or his zeal to work for what he believed was best for his country. He has been a courageous Member of this House. He has not been afraid to do the disagreeable things which many shrink from. As a result of his tireless industry and his ceaseless watchfulness, he has saved the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars. We regret to see him go, because we need more than one "watchdog of the Treasury" as we move toward the abyss of wild inflation or national bankruptcy.

"Bob" RICH leaves with our best wishes for happiness and prosperity in the years ahead; and may they be legion.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. ARENDS. I want to say that during the 8 years I have been in Congress, I have enjoyed my association, both on and off the floor of the House, with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I admire and respect him for his honesty, sincere convictions, and for his doggedness and determination in doing the things that he believes to be right. I regret that his oft-repeated question, "Where are you going to get the money?" still remains unanswered by anyone. Some day it may be answered, but before the gentleman leaves this House, I hope that he will delegate to someone else the right to ask that question from time to time. It has been a pleasure to serve with such an upright Christian individual like the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I regret more than I can say his voluntary retirement from this House, because he has served such a worth-while purpose, both to his district and to the Nation.

I am glad of the privilege that has been mine to know and associate with you, Bob, and to always remember you as my good friend.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I believe all Members of Congress, whether they always agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania or not, appreciate the very able work that he has been doing in trying to keep down appropriations. I think all Members, Democrats and Republicans alike, are sorry to see him leave because they recognize in him an able, honest, and courageous legislator, one who has the courage of his convictions, and an outstanding American. In speaking these few words I feel that I represent Members on both sides of the House. We are very sorry that he will not be with us in the next Congress as we will need his brand of courage and Americanism in solving the tremendous problems with which our country will be confronted.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my colleague. I think I can say that I speak for practically all of the Members on the Democratic side of the House when I say that he has the respect of all for his sincerity and his devotion to duty. He has done everything that he possibly could for the best interest of the country, according to his own conscience, and it is certainly a regret to many Members personally that he decided to not again become a candidate for office. He has been diligent, faithful, and true to his convictions, and not afraid to express his ideas, thus gaining the respect of every Member of the House. I know personally that his service has been of much benefit not only to his constituents, but to the State of Pennsylvania and to the country at large. I wish for him and his family the utmost in health, happiness, and success for many years to come.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have served in the House along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I came here after a special election, just a year before the gentleman himself came. It has been my privilege to listen to most of the many remarks that he has made on this floor. I express regret that he was unable to find an answer to his celebrated question of where we were going to get the money during that period, but no one can charge the gentleman with a faltering determination or a lack of endeavor to get an answer to the question. This gentleman has been untiring in his devotion to the rights of the people. He has been unfaltering in his study of this Government and in a desire to uphold one of the pillars on which its stability rests, namely, State rights. I compliment him upon that and for another thing. I do not believe there is a Member of this House more unfailing in his efforts to serve both his people in his district and the people of this Nation in accordance with what he honestly in his heart thought was right. We are going to miss him. I as an individual will miss him as a friend, and I wish him well and the merriest of Christmases and lots and lots of happy new years.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, this has been a happy day so far. Two gentlemen who have spoken are both going into voluntary retirement. I know I voice the sentiment of my fellow Republicans in the House when I wish the gentleman well. We will miss the gentleman and his courage and straightforwardness and his honesty. He has been very helpful to us in Pennsylvania in the councils when we have met and he has furnished us a guide by having the courage to go down in the Well and speak his thoughts. So we say to him, may God be with you. All I can say is in the language of psalmist:

Commit thy way unto the Lord, trust also in Him, and He shall bring it to pass.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I could not permit this opportunity to pass without saying a few words concerning the distinguished gentleman's record as I have observed it during the past 6 years. Like one of the distinguished gentlemen who has already spoken, I may say that the gentleman has seldom addressed the Members of this House when I have not tried to hear what he was saying. He has always made valuable contributions to the service of his country. There were times of course when we could not agree, but we always admired the gentleman's courage and gave serious thought to his advice. The gentleman has always had the intestinal stamina to tell the country what he thought and why he thought it. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, though he comes from an industrial section, has always been sympathetic to the agricultural interests of the country and to the interests of my own

great State. Although at times he may have had to strain a point, he helped us of the West in our great reclamation projects and exhibited an understanding of them not given to all Members from the East.

The gentleman will be missed not only in this House but he will be missed by his State and by the Nation, and may God bless him.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Probably no man in the House has crossed swords with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] more often than I have, but I have always found him a foe worthy of my steel.

I can say for him that he has been sober and on the job ever since he has been in Congress. He has that rare quality so essential and so necessary for a successful legislator, that is, moral courage to express his convictions. He has won the love, affection, respect, and esteem of the entire membership of this House. I want him to know that wherever he goes he will carry with him our best wishes at all times. I trust that he may always enjoy those blessings which Shakespeare refers to as "honor, love, obedience, and troops of friends."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS of Arkansas). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and insert an article by Ernest G. Draper on small business, as appearing in yesterday's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and incorporate therein two short letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday I may be given 30 minutes in which to address the House, after the other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LXXXVIII—600

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

BONNEVILLE POWER, PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE: A REVIEW OF LEGISLATION, CONSTRUCTION, AND OBSTRUCTIONS

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment? I am compelled to leave in a few minutes.

Mr. PIERCE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I want to say with reference to my dear friend, the distinguished speaker at the moment, that no Member of this House will be missed more. Nobody has rendered more faithful or earnest effort to make a substantial contribution to the work of this House. If I may have permission, I shall extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I want to say just one other thing. I wish the country as a whole could look in on this proceeding today. It is a great compliment to the House, to the genius of the American system of government, that men may earnestly differ on each side of this aisle and differ with respect to each other. If I may make this observation, I think that the deliberation of this House and the attitude of the Members is a demonstration of the fact that in the formation of policy it is necessary to have a great many people, coming from various sections of the country. The gentleman from Oregon, who is now about to address us, has made a most valuable contribution in that direction. I am proud to recognize myself as his friend.

Mr. PIERCE. On Wednesday I will deliver my last speech in this House and it will be partly on the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and in a measure in reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas made a few days ago on the farm problem in this situation. I would be pleased indeed to have the gentleman in the audience at that time. Today I am speaking on the Columbia River and on tomorrow I will close my discussion on timber. On Wednesday I will close with my remarks on the work of the Committee on Agriculture, particularly with reference to the A. A. A., with some degree of reply to the brilliant address made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], a few days ago, in which he tried to picture the position of the farmers in the present crisis.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this may not be the last speech of my distinguished friend from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] in the House, but in my opinion it will be his most important address.

I want to say at this point, and I say it advisedly, that he has done more for the power consumers of Oregon than any other man of his day and generation. I know whereof I speak, because we worked together for the passage of the bill that now provides the people of his State with electricity from the Bonneville Dam.

In doing so he has left his footprints on the sands of time. The influence of his work will last long after he has disappeared from the stage of action.

An old man, going a lone highway,
Came, at evening, cold and gray,
To a chasm, vast and deep and wide,
Through which was flowing a sullen tide.
The old man crossed in the twilight dim;
The sullen stream had no fears for him;
But he turned, when safe on the other side,
And built a bridge to span the tide.
"Old man," said a fellow pilgrim, near,
"You are wasting strength with building here;
Your journey will end with the ending day;
You never again must pass this way;
You have crossed the chasm, deep and wide,
Why build you the bridge at the eventide?"
The builder lifted his old gray head:
"Good friend, in the path I have come," he said,

"There followeth after me today
A youth, whose feet must pass this way.
This chasm, that has been naught to me,
To that fair-haired youth may a pitfall be.
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim;
Good friend, I am building the bridge for him."

The gentleman from Oregon has built for the youth of the Northwest for all time to come.

Mr. PIERCE. I thank my friend from the Southland for his beautiful, eloquent words.

Mr. Speaker, many times during the last half century I have stood on the southern bank of the Columbia River and watched with eager interest the white-crested waves with their latent electric power rushing in a wild race to the sea. As I have looked, I have visualized one of the most magnificent natural settings on this globe. Those restless waves, carrying such enormous potential value, start from the glaciers and the snowfields of the Rockies and the Selkirks, high on the western slope of the Continental Divide. Gathering numerous smaller streams, the Columbia River, as it passes along the northern boundary of Oregon, carries nearly half as much water as the great Mississippi. This river is, without question, the finest, most valuable electric power stream in all the world. Army engineers have estimated, after careful survey, that it can provide 50 percent as much power as is now produced in all the United States. Twenty million kilowatts may be developed on this river and its tributaries, and the entire United States is developing only a little more than 40,000,000 kilowatts of salable electricity.

MY EFFORTS TO HAVE THE POWER USED

As I have gazed on this magnificent stream in its primitive greatness, power, and strength, I have often wondered whether its benefits would inure to the people or whether they would be acquired by the strong financial groups which have such a stranglehold on governmental organizations that they can

exact tribute from all the people and make them believe they cannot run their own business.

I have, at various intervals, tried to arouse public interest in this great natural resource. I helped to organize the Oregon State Hydro-Electric League many years ago and as Governor I tried to interest people in developing the power of the Columbia River. When I heard Franklin D. Roosevelt state in September 1932, that the next great Federal development of electric power must be made on the Columbia River, my heart leaped with joy. I then realized that the dreams of a half century might come true.

As a Member of the Congress for the last 10 years, I have frequently spoken on this subject. I have appeared before various committees, asking for appropriations to install generators and to construct transmission lines. I have done everything within my power to promote and bring to early completion the dams and powerhouses at Bonneville and Coulee. As I saw the dark clouds of war gathering over our land, especially after Munich, I redoubled my efforts to bring about early completion of the two Columbia River power plants with their possibility of developing two and one-half million kilowatts which would be needed to alleviate the threatened power shortage which I could not make Washington officials understand. This great development is only one-eighth of the amount feasible from this river and its tributaries.

A year ago when the Japanese so treacherously struck at Pearl Harbor, these plants were nearly 50 percent completed and today they are pouring into the transmission lines nearly a million kilowatts which are being used to make aluminum and magnesium, and to drive the fast-moving machinery of factory and shipbuilding in the Pacific Northwest.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP AND DISTRIBUTION

From platform and in the Halls of Congress, I have done everything in my power to make the people understand that they themselves should distribute electric current without depending upon financing and operation by absentee holding companies and their satellites. The sons and daughters of the pioneers who settled the Pacific Northwest have certainly lost the independence and driving power of their fathers who were able to overcome so many obstacles in their paths, if they continue to be persuaded that they are incapable of themselves distributing, among themselves, this electric current.

Through newspapers and by various agencies and with bribery and corruption the private utilities have delayed the public power movement. There is sworn testimony that private utilities have spent a million dollars within the past 10 years to influence public opinion in the Northwest. I know the desperate fight the people will have to make if they keep for themselves the benefits of the Columbia River.

ELECTRIC DISTRIBUTION AN IDEAL BUSINESS

Since Edison divided the current and made the incandescent lamp possible, the selling of electricity has become one of the finest and most profitable businesses in which capital can be invested. Here are a few of the reasons why men engage in the light and power business and seek to monopolize it:

First. To most people it seems like magic and reserved for experts to handle. Nobody knows what electricity is; nobody has been able to see it or to give an understandable definition of this greatest of all Nature's gifts to mankind. We know only how to create it and use it.

Second. The quantity is inexhaustible, and as it may not be successfully stored, it must be used as generated.

Third. It is an essential commodity because the electric current lights and heats homes and turns the wheels of industry.

Fourth. It is a natural monopoly; no city would permit duplicating and competitive sewer or water systems, and every community should have but one transmission system delivering electricity to homes and factories and lighting its streets.

Fifth. No other business needs as small a pay roll, for, when once installed it requires but few men to watch the wheels go around and read the meters which are not generally understood by customers, so they cannot measure the current and figure the cost of the electricity they use.

Sixth. The seller has no bad accounts because cutting of the wire leaves the home or factory in darkness and bills are promptly paid for self-protection.

Seventh. Electricity is an ideal light, a perfect power, which can be turned off when not needed and called upon at any moment to perform its work.

Eighth. No advertising expense is necessary, for it sells itself, and buyers want it in ever-increasing quantity.

Ninth. In most factories expensive machinery must be constantly renewed. It is not so in the electric light and power business depending on streams which flow on; dams are permanent and hydro-plant repairs are inexpensive.

Tenth. There is no bad capital investment if the business is honestly conducted because, being a utility, it falls under the control of State commissions, which universally have the right to fix rates high enough to pay expenses and interest on investment. It is, in fact, a cost-plus business, ideally perfect for Wall Street financiers who are the absentee overlords of most operating companies. It is also an ideal business for cooperative community effort.

STEALING COLUMBIA RIVER POWER

As I have dreamed of the possibilities of regional advantages because of this water power, I have often said, "Watch out, Wall Street will yet steal the power of the Columbia River." This will be and is being accomplished through forced interconnections and long-term contracts between Bonneville Administration and the private utilities. These private companies should buy and not borrow Bonneville power and they should not dictate the terms.

There must be legislation creating a Columbia River Authority to control power policies for the Federal plants on the Columbia River. Thus only can be prevented repetition of the Niagara scandal, and monopolization of the power by private utilities and the Aluminum Company of America.

I have stood at Boulder Dam and watched the struggling waters as they turned the turbines there and transmitted power over wires to the millions of southern California. Yes; some advantage has come to those people but much of it was lost by the insistence of President Hoover that the power must all be sold and contracted for by private companies and monopolies or by municipalities before the appropriations could be made for the development. We were not so handicapped on the Columbia River, for President Roosevelt evidently started the development with the intention that the people of the Northwest should enjoy its benefits. One of my great regrets in retiring from Congress at this time is that I cannot fight in the front ranks in this battle to save the power of the Columbia River for the people.

This electric power can make a new world in the Pacific Northwest because it is available at one-third of the cost of any steam-generated power in any section of the world. I have visioned our rapid development in the light-metal age just ahead. If Wall Street is successful in its fight to take tribute from users of Columbia River power, the people will lose their heritage and the future of the Northwest will not be bright.

The power of the Columbia River is worth a thousand million dollars. This power is more valuable than all the gold mines in the United States. This year, 1942, its electric power will bring into the United States Treasury over \$7,000,000; next year it will bring into the Treasury over \$15,000,000. This is the income with only one-half completion of the possible generation at Bonneville and Coulee and with power sold at the cheapest prices in the world. The two projects develop only about one-eighth of the possibilities of the River. They exhaust no natural resources, for the river will run as long as day returns, as long as winds drive the moist air against the mountain tops. Oh, that the bankers, the newspaper owners, the merchants, the farmers, the professional men, the laboring men, all classes, would make a supreme effort to save this great heritage for themselves and their children!

THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Because I think it important to preserve the history of the electric development of the Columbia River, I am recording in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the legislative steps, the story of the construction and something of obstructions overcome. All this must be understood by those who legislate and appropriate in the future.

When the full history of these times is written, I feel certain that the accomplishments of this Administration in the development of electric power will be given a high place in the record of national progress. The initial vision in this

field came from our Chief Executive and his immediate advisers, but it devolved upon the Congress to translate this vision into an accomplished fact. I was present at the birth of this idea, having been given the opportunity of introducing Candidate Roosevelt to his Portland, Oreg., audience when he first presented his now famous power principles and outlined plans for the Columbia River development. As a Member of Congress, I have had a substantial part in translating these policies into law and action. However, during the last campaign, the record of this fine accomplishment was clouded by irrelevant issues. I found that Congress was censured because of deterrent circumstances and conditions that resulted entirely from the decisions of reactionary temporary war agencies.

My purpose today is to record the legislative history of the Columbia River project so that the record will be straight and the acts of Congress placed in their true light as a foundation for future Congresses to build upon. I do this to demonstrate that Congress acted with vision and foresight and to show that, without this vision, our maximum war effort would have been greatly delayed, entailing large losses of life and treasure. I also wish to offer some constructive ideas for the benefit of those who must make future decisions on legislation relating to electric-power development and use in order that the principles Congress has written into law will be perpetuated and furthered. These observations are based on nearly 40 years' experience covering activity as a power constructor and operator, as a public administrator, Governor of a State, and as a member of State and national legislative bodies.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF COLUMBIA RIVER POWER PRIOR TO 1932

During the last World War the possibility of developing the power resources of the Columbia River was the subject of renewed interest and discussion, but no positive action was taken except routine reports by the State engineer of Oregon, and feasibility reports by the Bureau of Reclamation. Several years prior to that time we had organized a public-power league to encourage interest and study of the possibilities—the Oregon Hydro-Electric League.

The first congressional action came with the passage of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1925, which is Public 585 of the Sixty-eighth Congress. This 1925 act directed the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers to prepare and submit to Congress an estimate of the costs of surveys of navigable streams where power possibilities might be considered feasible. This act was the first step of the legal procedure needed to formulate plans for the multipurpose improvement of the outstanding waterways of the country.

Pursuant to this authorization the Secretary of War submitted a report to the succeeding Congress, which was printed as House Document No. 308 of the first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress. This report included the Columbia River and its principal tributaries, and resulted in congressional authorization in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1927 for the recommended surveys.

As a result of the 1927 authorization the Corps of Engineers proceeded with the necessary investigations, examinations and surveys in order to formulate general plans for effectuating the multipurpose development of the Columbia River. In March of 1932, on the completion of the authorized investigations, the Secretary of War submitted a report to Congress covering full details of the proposals embodied in the previous authorizing legislation. This report was printed as House Document No. 103, first session of the Seventy-third Congress. This House Document was a comprehensive report and laid the foundations for the development of the Columbia River into the largest system of low-cost hydroelectric power possible in the United States. Therefore, at the time of the President's Portland speech in September 1932 the necessary surveys, reports, and groundwork plans were available to formulate the policy governing the construction and operation of the Columbia River multi-purpose dams and plants.

GRANTS OF MONEY

With this foundation and the enactment of the N. I. R. A. Act of 1933, the Secretary of the Interior, as Public Works Administrator, made allotments to the Secretary of War for the purpose of starting the construction of the first Federal dam on the Columbia River, to be located at Bonneville. Work on the Bonneville Dam was commenced on September 30, 1933, under the direction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, as Public Works Project No. 28. Grand Coulee was also started as a Public Works allocation on January 1, 1934, under grant OPO 5-5, dated August 10, 1933.

Growing out of the Colorado River controversy, the Supreme Court, in 1935, handed down the so-called Farker Dam decision, to the effect that dams on navigable streams could be constitutional by only congressional action. Executive grants or allotments were declared not constitutional for such a purpose. As a result, Bonneville and Grand Coulee were then authorized by Congress, in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1935, which is known as Public Law No. 409, Seventy fourth Congress, approved August 30, 1935.

THE FUNDAMENTAL BONNEVILLE ACT

As early as 1935, Congress was informed that the first two Bonneville generating units would go into operation about the middle of 1938, without any basic marketing and administrative authorizations. Following the passage, in 1935, of the authorization act—Public, 409—bills were introduced, in 1935 and 1936, intended to cover the administration of these facilities. These bills did not receive the benefit of any extensive committee hearings and were never reported out for action.

In January 1937 the President created, by Executive order, a National Power Policy Committee headed by Secretary Ickes and instructed to formulate policies governing the operation of the Columbia River projects. This committee drafted a proposed Bonneville bill, which was immediately offered in both Houses and extensive committee hearings were initiated.

The Pacific Northwest is greatly indebted to our esteemed colleague from Mississippi, the Honorable JOHN E. RANKIN. Without his counsel and assistance, the Columbia River plants with their vast war contributions would not have been possible. Shortly after the original national power policy bill was introduced it became apparent that an attempt would be made to load this bill down with unworkable modifying amendments. At this point, as a matter of strategy, Representative RANKIN came to me and suggested that I write and introduce a Bonneville bill. In February 1937 I started work on such a bill—H. R. 6387—which I introduced shortly thereafter.

My bill was, in its major principles, in agreement with the bill sponsored by the National Power Policy Committee. In April 1937 I appeared before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of this House to urge the adoption of H. R. 6387, and at that time I pointed out in detail the differences in all the pending bills. My presentation is in the record of the Rivers and Harbors Committee hearings for 1937 and was also covered in my speech entitled "Bonneville Power Project," which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 12, 1937.

After full hearings, Secretary Ickes personally appeared before the committee and urged the adoption of H. R. 6387 as presenting a feasible plan for power administration and marketing. A short time thereafter, the Rivers and Harbors Committee submitted a committee bill which was substantially the same as H. R. 6387 and the House passed this bill in June 1937. The Senate bill, as later passed, conformed with the House committee bill and both bills were consolidated in conference and enacted into law as the Bonneville Act, approved August 20, 1937. The Senate bill which went to conference was the result of the outstanding contributions made by Senators McNary, Bone, Steiwer, and Schwellenbach. This act, in my opinion, constitutes the cornerstone for all future constructive legislation, covering the administration of public river development projects dedicated to the public interest.

CONTROVERSIAL POINTS ON PUBLIC POWER

When in the early part of 1937 the power bill, H. R. 6387, was before the Rivers and Harbors Committee, it became apparent that there were decided and fundamental differences of opinion. These controversial points were:

First. Monopolization of Federal power by limited private groups.

Second. Yardstick principle, rate control, and types of wholesale rates.

Third. Widespread economic use of hydroelectric power for the general welfare as opposed to small area concentration for private gain.

Fourth. Mandates on transmission lines and interconnections.

Fifth. Reservations and preferences for public bodies, and benefits for the general public, and in particular for domestic and rural consumers.

Sixth. Plant extensions.

Seventh. Contract terms.

Eighth. Cost allocation.

Ninth. Federal recovery of power investment.

Tenth. Equitable distribution of benefits resulting from the Federal investment.

All of these issues were settled by extensive debates and were written into law as representing congressional policy. The record on these controversial points is clear and decisive. In the early days of the Bonneville appropriations, this debate was continued and again settled, on numerous occasions, by floor votes. I contributed, from time to time, my analysis on all these points in the form of speeches and debates during the Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses.

These Federal policies, written into law, are basic, sound, constructive, far-seeing, and democratic. It is my earnest prayer that they will never be disturbed or set aside, and that the Columbia River projects will always be operated strictly in accordance with these accepted principles. If this is accomplished, the people of the Pacific Northwest will have occasion to rejoice in the years to come. I consider the perpetuation of these policies a task and a test for those who follow me. It is worthy of the best efforts of those who desire to dedicate their labors to the public welfare.

POWER IN RELATION TO METALS

In the years which will follow, we will find metals and power more closely interrelated than in the past. The metals of the future will be products of the electric furnace and the electric cell. The older conventional direct low-temperature coal-fired metal furnaces will have to give way to electric processes in order to secure high strength, lightweight, and cheap, high-quality metals demanded by lightweight, high-speed machines. Electricity for such use must be priced low in order to meet future foreign competition and inferior substitutes. To process such quality metals requires large blocks of low-cost power. The electric current needed is so large per metal unit that a differential of 1 mil per kilowatt-hour in power cost will add about 1 cent a pound to the selling price of the metal. The best possible steam power will cost two and a half to three times the cost of the hydro power of the Columbia River, and can, therefore, never become competitive in the field of base metal production. Without the low-cost electric metals, produced with Niagara hydro power, the automobile industry would not have been possible. It was the early conception and use of these ideas that perfected the mechanized German war machine. It was the lack of conception and use of such ideas and yielding to monopolistic opposition that has and will make our own war effort more costly in lives and in treasure.

SCARCITY OF ESSENTIAL MATERIALS

In this connection, another important angle should be mentioned. Scanning the pages of history we find that nations deficient in native materials, either through exhaustion, lack of deposits, or improper utilization of what they had, became decadent nations. As a nation, we have been spending our resources at

such a high rate it will become necessary for us to stop and analyze our own situation in regard to materials if we are to preserve our own status and safeguard our position for the future.

In just a few years we will see our bauxite deposits depleted, and in a decade the hematite iron ores of the Mesabi and Lake Superior regions will be mined out. The same situation applies to petroleum, as well as to numerous other metals and base manufacturing materials. We must find substitutes and new processes to develop the low-grade complex ores and organic products of our soils.

CONTRIBUTION OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

The entire West, especially the Pacific Northwest, is in a position to make a great and substantial contribution in resources. What this vast region can produce and contribute has been utterly ignored by prejudiced and narrow men who have controlled our war agencies. Unfortunately no real western technical talent was used by these agencies to lessen our war burdens and keep our taxes within safe and comfortable limits, nor have those with broad experience in this field been consulted. Eastern financial interests can no longer afford to hamper such western development, for if they do so, they will be contributing to the collapse of the system that has given them life, security, and luxury. Their actions have been largely determined by the desire to protect after-war monopoly. When our base hematite iron ores are depleted, we must look to the use of the western magnetite iron deposits processed by new methods to replace or augment the old blast furnace practice.

ELECTRIC PRODUCTS AND PROCESSES

New electric processes grew out of the industrial requirements of high temperatures needed to dissociate base metals from complex compounds. Temperatures possible with coal processes were too low for commercial use in developing high-quality materials. At the beginning of this century we find electric processes applied only to aluminum, calcium, graphite, silicon, a limited number of ferro-alloys, sodium, and copper. Since 1900 this field has been greatly improved and numerous new materials have entered the electric production field, for example, the great extension of the line of ferro-alloys. Since I was Governor of Oregon the "new metal of the future" has been added to the list of electro-metals, namely, magnesium. Also added to this line of electro materials are zinc, fused quartz, tungsten, bismuth, cadmium, manganese, and numerous other substances like the line of acids, chlorites, soda, as well as a line of gases, steel castings, a type of synthetic rubber, and numerous other products.

The remarkable performance of the west coast Kaiser shipyards has caught the imagination of the man on the street as a symbol of the "can be done" perspective. The secret of Henry Kaiser's outstanding and remarkable success has been the use of electric processes. With a crew of dam builders, inexperienced in the older conventional shipbuilding methods, but thoroughly experienced in

modern electric methods, and having the knack of surmounting natural obstacles, he has created new large ships at unheard-of production speeds. Kaiser and his crew of dam builders from Boulder, Bonneville, and Coulee Dams are turning Bonneville and Coulee power into finished ships at record-breaking and pace-setting rates. One reason for this success is the use of electric cranes, apparatus, and electric arc welding. A prime reason is an organization of forceful men untrammelled by tradition. Twenty-five percent of Kaiser workers, including men and women, are handling the electric arc welders and cutters. These electric processes are now used on ship construction from stem to stern and from the lowest keel plates and sections to the highest point on the masthead. Without the electric methods high-speed ship construction would not be possible. Within the last year some of the points that I have constantly emphasized in the Bonneville debates have become demonstrated realities. Volumes could be used in describing these new electric processes. I am merely hitting the high places in order to point out the picture of the future and how it is tied up with low-cost electric power.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIAL SHORTAGES

In both war and commerce, the degree of national self-sufficiency in strategic and critical materials is of paramount importance. Success in both of these fields depends on the national internal development of such types of resources or substitutes therefor. Specialists in this field have classified some 30 major base industrial materials which can be used as a measure of independence in national supply. Measured by such a yardstick, Germany was, in 1939, internally deficient in 22 base materials out of the listed 30, and Japan was short in 21. This explains their urge for conquest. However, Germany compensated for such deficiencies in part by development of the so-called ersatz processes, or, in our language, substitute processes, the best known of their long line being synthetic rubber.

This problem of strategic materials is not a new one, as it came to the front very forcibly in the First World War but has been multiplied since manifold by advanced technical developments and inventions. If the First World War had lasted a longer period, we would have found that our industrial system would have broken down, as distress signals were evident in the fall of 1918, due to dependence on foreign material sources and a deficiency of ship transport resulting from submarine and military appropriation of ships. This always happens in wartimes.

Congress took the lead in the solution of this highly important problem as long ago as 1920, when the National Defense Act of 1920 was passed. This act placed the responsibility for wartime industrial mobilization and material procurement in the hands of the Assistant Secretary of War. From 1920 to 1939 no real advances were made toward a substantial solution of this problem. All that the country secured in this interim, both

during Republican and Democratic regimes, was debates between the departments and technical societies. No outright plan was submitted in this interim by the departments to the Congress for enactment into law.

CONGRESS HAD FORESIGHT

In the latter part of 1938 the Senate Military Affairs Committee decided to reopen this highly important subject and, as a result, Congress passed in June 1939 the Thomas Act, authorizing a strategic material procurement and development program, including rubber. Congress was way in advance of the war agencies in the solution of this problem and gave those agencies the necessary authorization and tools with which to work.

The shortages we are encountering today is entirely the result of poor judgment and profit-seeking manipulation on the part of the men imported into the hastily constructed and poorly organized war agencies. If they had heeded the prod given them by Congress, our people, the small business proprietors, and our farmers would have been spared most of the hardships they are now encountering. In the late election, the voters did not seem to recognize the real authors of their troubles and took it out on Congress. Numerous newspaper columnists and writers had sown the seeds for such a protest vote by putting out incorrect information. I hope that for the sake of the record, Congress will dig deeply enough to bring out the essential facts, so that Congress will be placed in its correct position and the real culprits exposed.

SECURING BONNEVILLE GENERATING UNITS

At the time of the enactment of the Bonneville Act, in August 1937, only two generating machines, totaling the relatively small amount of 86,000 kilowatts, had been authorized for Bonneville project, and these were in process of construction. No generating machines had been authorized at the Grand Coulee Dam.

When the Bonneville Act was in process of enactment, all interested proponents of this legislation recognized that good administration required that the Administrator charged with the responsibility of marketing this power should be the person to say when new generating equipment should be installed. As a result, the Bonneville Act provided, in section 2, that the Secretary of War shall install additional generating equipment when in the judgment of the Administrator such additional generating facilities were desirable to meet actual or potential markets.

At the time the Bonneville Act was pending, early in 1937, a competent engineer, Mr. J. P. Alvey, with a good background in power construction and operation, and experience in the last war as a staff officer, came to me and suggested that the argument raised by the opponents of Bonneville as to the lack of power markets was intended to curtail development and was a national disservice. He pointed out that I should investigate what happened in the last war in the power-metal situation, what mod-

ern commerce and defense required, and what was then taking place in Germany. He pointed out where accurate information would be obtained and commented that he felt certain that after I had made such an investigation I would conclude that it was highly important that the maximum number of Bonneville units be installed as early as possible, and that the Bonneville and Coulee plants be integrated by high-voltage transmission lines, in order to early secure the greatest possible amount of firm, low-cost, hydro-power.

I made such an investigation, during which I talked to men thoroughly familiar with the new electro-metal situation, with industrial development, with the Niagara operation and production, and with the metal-airplane operations in Germany, gained from actual operating contacts in Europe. I early saw the picture and then conferred on this point with the gentleman from Mississippi. After extended discussions, our colleague suggested that we cover this with the new Bonneville Administrator, when he was appointed, as he felt that new units and high-voltage lines could be authorized by Congress in spite of the "no-market propaganda" put out by selfish interests. I also early conferred with our former colleague, Judge Leavy, of Washington State, who was leading in the Grand Coulee fight for authorizations and appropriations.

I then talked to an engineer, the late Mr. J. D. Ross, when his appointment as Bonneville Administrator was definitely scheduled, and suggested that the matter of additional Bonneville units and transmission lines be immediately initiated. He said it would be done in steps, as he would of necessity have to make an investigation through his chief engineer, Mr. Charles E. Carey. Our colleague the Honorable J. E. RANKIN also covered this subject independently with Mr. Ross after I had left for Oregon in the fall of 1937. Mr. Ross, in the late fall of 1937, advised me that he would initially ask for two new units, and funds to make a start on transmission lines from the Bonneville plant to the Vancouver-Portland area. This he did.

No history of the development of the Columbia River plants would be complete without reference to the great vision of the late J. D. Ross, and later the small group who in 1935 were responsible for the Columbia River Planning Report. Mr. Ross at an early date pictured the benefits that would come to the Northwest from the integration of the Columbia River plants. His original concepts were expanded and included in the comprehensive planning report of 1935, which had not been called to my attention at the time I drafted H. R. 6387, although I had conferred with Mr. Ross on the practical aspects of some of the controversial points in H. R. 6387. I have later examined the material, and I find that the conclusions were far reaching and coincided with the principles drafted by the Power Policy Committee.

Early in 1938 Mr. Ross, who had then become Bonneville Administrator, was

in Washington in connection with hearings on his initial budget requests, and at that time Mr. RANKIN and this speaker, called a meeting of Senate and House Members interested in Bonneville and invited Mr. Ross to sit in. Out of this meeting came an understanding on a plan which was to ask for the remaining Bonneville units, and a 220 kilovolt tie-transmission line to the Grand Coulee plant, then in construction. At that time the matter of administering Grand Coulee power was not settled, and the purpose of the tie-line was to firm Bonneville units 9 and 10 in low-water years over and above what could be accomplished by economic river-flow regulation by reservoirs.

As a result of these first requests of Mr. Ross, the War Department submitted a Budget estimate covering two additional Bonneville units—Nos. 3 and 4. When this estimate was received by Congress, I invited the engineer who first pointed out the necessity for further development to go with me to discuss this matter with our esteemed colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable BUELL SNYDER, chairman of the War Department Appropriations Subcommittee. At this point I wish to pay tribute to the early vision of Representative SNYDER, as his understanding of the problem and his assistance prepared the way for a much quicker expansion of our air program.

As a result of these efforts, the House passed the War Department Civil Appropriations Act, containing authorization for Bonneville units 3 and 4, which was approved June 11, 1938. At the same time, the President and Secretary Ickes allotted funds out of the 1938 P. W. A. appropriation to construct the following transmission lines: Bonneville to Grand Coulee, The Dalles, Kelso, and Willamette Valley.

Thus, early in 1938 the future Bonneville program was settled, and a real start was made. I will hereafter bring out the contribution to our war efficiency resulting from this series of early and almost prophetic efforts.

Bonneville units 5 to 10 were requested by Administrator Ross in the fall of 1938. Secretary Ickes, after investigation and approval, sent a formal request to the Secretary of War asking for such action. For reasons unknown to this speaker, when the request reached Congress it covered only units 5 and 6. These were authorized and funds appropriated therefor in the War Department civil functions appropriations bill of 1939.

Bonneville units 7 to 10 were involved in an error. When the annual request for funds to continue work on units 5 and 6 came to the House floor we found that through an error in committee testimony the committee had placed a limitation of six units on the size of the Bonneville plant. The House approved through misunderstanding, limiting the ultimate development to six units. When this reached the floor and the error was discovered interested House Members decided that the best strategy was to allow the correction to be made in the Senate.

Senator HOLMAN, of Oregon, came to the Seventy-sixth Congress with very definite ideas as to the further development of Bonneville as an aid to defense and the industrial upbuilding of the Pacific Northwest. His reactions on these points were entirely independent of what was approved in the House but coincided with what had been started, and his contributions in this direction since have been very substantial. He independently caught this error and successfully urged upon the Senate not only the correction of the limitation, but, in addition, an authorization for Bonneville generating units 7 to 10. When the conference report reached the House I succeeded in retaining the Senate amendment. This action finished necessary congressional authorization and provided funds for the completion of the Bonneville generating plant.

THE OPPOSITION TO BONNEVILLE DEVELOPMENT

During the various congressional procedures on Bonneville items throughout the past 6 years, the proponents met with many different kinds of opposition, emanating from the private power companies, especially from the Electric Bond & Share groups. They were wary in not directly fighting the unit authorizations. By circulars and by material supplied to certain newspaper writers they created the atmosphere of "lack of market," with the resulting reaction against generating-plant extension.

Every time a Bonneville-Interior Department transmission item was before Congress, up to Pearl Harbor, during the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses, Mr. Kinsey Robinson, president of the Washington Water Power Co., or some of his associates moved to Washington, D. C., set up an anti-Bonneville lobby, promoted nullifying amendments, and furnished material to the press and to opposition Members. They even went so far as to threaten Members with defeat at the polls for supporting Bonneville appropriations. In addition, their agents—namely, the Gadsden committee—circularized members of the House Appropriations Committee giving them incorrect information. The record on this opposition is full and complete.

Such private-utility lobbying activities have reached back over 10 years, and interested researchers can profitably extend their knowledge by reading the Senate's Couzens committee report, dealing with Electric Bond & Share manipulations and collusion with Federal departmental employees.

For the benefit of those who desire to search basic documents on Columbia River power development I suggest study of the Senate Interior appropriation hearings of April 7, 1939, and March 29, 1940, the House Interior appropriation hearings of February 15, 1940, and the House debates on Interior appropriation bills during 1938, 1939, and 1940 and 1941, as given in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A review of this record, together with an analysis of the present war load routing and use of Bonneville-Coulee power will show that if Ebasco's proposals were followed in 1939, 1940, and 1941, this Na-

tion's air and ship program would have been materially reduced. Fortunately, Congress followed the leadership of the Northwest delegation, rather than heeding the lobbying activities of Ebasco's agents.

WAR AGENCIES CONTINUE OPPOSITION

After making the unsuccessful fights in Congress on Bonneville from 1935 up to Pearl Harbor, the same private power lobby opposition group moved into the war agencies—O. P. M., W. P. B., and O. P. A.—where they were completely successful. By control of priorities and load placements, and by promoting political activities, they have taken over the control of the economic destinies of the Pacific Northwest. In so doing, this malign group has not only retarded the industrial development of our last frontier but has hindered production of airplanes needed by our hard-pressed forces.

Six months before Pearl Harbor, when an Interior appropriation bill was under consideration, particularly the Bonneville items, it was openly stated in the Capitol corridors that the opposition did not care whether the current bill was passed, as Ebasco would control the situation through its agents in the priority sections of O. P. M. The irony of this situation is that the arch enemies of progressive development for the Northwest and of full airplane production, were actually rewarded by promotion into positions of authority at O. P. M. and W. P. B., where they have assumed and used illegal powers in their destructive decisions unchecked by anyone in the very same administration which undertook and financed the great Columbia River plants—ostensibly for the public good. One of Ebasco's agents, an Oregon private utility official who fought these Bonneville measures, has received his medal of award for obstructive tactics by appointment as a special State Department emissary to Brazil. In Oregon recently I heard the propaganda, that this Brazil appointment was indicative of the fact that the administration thought that Ebasco was right in its previous positions, and that the delegation that fathered Bonneville was wrong.

This obstructionist group has the effrontery to assert their high patriotic contributions, whereas the activities I have mentioned, when appraised in the light of 1942 power requirements, are definitely in the fifth-column class. The sad part of this story is that a few men with a limited power background but employed by Federal agencies were given high positions in W. P. B., as window dressing to cover up the wretched manipulations of the real overlords of this agency.

THE RECORD SHOULD BE COMPLETED AND PUBLICIZED

In the next few years, when the war load tapers off, Congress will be receiving complaints from the people of the Pacific Northwest because regional development has been hindered. Members of Congress who receive such complaints, must be prepared to meet these justifiable objections with solid facts. The only way to do this effectively is for the Congressional committees to call for the

complete files of all the executive agencies clothed with some measure of jurisdiction over Northwest power. These files should be briefed, and the information that a few of us have put into the record should be extended and made public. As a private citizen, I intend to spend my remaining years and energies in completing this record and making it widely known in order to promote public interest in the constructive improvement of governmental processes. The fight for the public distribution of Columbia River power will continue as long as I live. I here serve notice that I did not take off my fighting clothes on November 4, 1942.

During the period that Ebasco and allied groups were running their Washington lobby they were also engaged in spreading the same misinformation in the Pacific Northwest and in promoting political reprisals against those who were responsible for the authorization and the completion of the Columbia River program. Every local private-utility office became political and propaganda headquarters. Many newspapers changed hands, and others blossomed into prosperity through utility advertising. My files are full of the record of such activities, and volumes can be filled with analysis of these subversive efforts. Those who are interested in pursuing this subject further can find such a record in the 1940 hearings of Federal Power Commission covering utility Pacific Northwest political and propaganda expenditures.

EASTERN OREGON INJURED

I cite for the benefit of interested public-power people the case of Umatilla County, Ore. Shortly before the House fight on Bonneville's eastward transmission lines, the press reported the Pendleton City Council as going on record to the effect that they did not need nor desire Bonneville power. As a result of this public expression, the reading of that statement on the House floor resulted in a close shave for the transmission lines appropriation, which was saved by one vote. When it came time to build the Walla Walla-Pendleton transmission line, naturally the Government agencies were forced to construct a low-capacity line with small wires and at 66,000 volts. This constitutes a permanent sectional disadvantage.

In the spring of this year a delegation from Pendleton spent several weeks in Washington for the purpose of securing additional industrial loads for that area. They left without accomplishing any results and without realizing that their own previous action had caused their failure. This failure resulted from the fact that W. P. B. load experts considered that Bonneville did not have sufficient energy and transmission capacity in that section. This is a situation that must be candidly accepted and corrected when the war is over if eastern Oregon is to secure benefits from the Columbia River power.

THE BULL'S-EYE CONFIRMS ILLEGAL OFFICIAL COLLUSION

The Portland General Electric Co. of Oregon publishes a small leaflet entitled

"The Bull's-Eye." The purpose of this publication is to place the company in a favorable position before the people. The November 1942 edition of this publication has come to my desk, and I deem it advisable for purposes of record to quote in part from this publication. I quote:

Kilowatts lose their identity.

Companies having surplus energy place the same in the power pool.

An engineering firm made extensive studies of power loads and power resources in the region.

Who paid this firm?

The War Production Board has placed its weight behind their program.

The only available source of additional energy was pooling.

Business-managed and political-managed public systems in five States—Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Utah—got together.

One interesting sidelight of the pooling arrangements is that power cannot be metered. The output of independent plants immediately loses its identity when pumped into the network, therefore charges between the utility systems must be based on daily schedules.

These astounding statements merit a factual investigation. Obviously they are largely incorrect. If the public accepts such statements literally, they must inquire whether the alliance of the private power companies and the W. P. B. is being used illegally to overcome deficiencies in private power capacity.

This extract from the Bull's-Eye of 1942 means this: The private power companies are using, and are running the Federal power investment in such a way that the preponderant kilowatts from the Federal plants have lost their identity. Anyone with any experience in the power business knows that metering is the cash register of the business. To admit that unmetered Federal electric energy is being used is tantamount to acknowledging that the private utility companies are raiding the Federal Treasury.

This publication should also cause citizens of Oregon and Washington to learn why their resources are being siphoned out from under them and taken into Idaho, Montana, and Utah to supply industrial plants that would not have been possible if their locations had been based on available power capacity.

This amazing document, in an effort to prove patriotic accomplishments, admits an unlawful application under the Bonneville Act. It admits displacing pay rolls in the Columbia River Basin and moving such opportunities into the States served by the privately owned lines of the Ebasco system.

Those who secure a copy of Bull's-Eye of November 1942 and read it closely will see what has happened contrary to Oregon's best interests. This is too important to permit neglect, so I have requested investigation by the Federal Power Commission and Federal Trade Commission.

REASONS FOR THE WAR-METAL SHORTAGE

In the early part of 1940 the foundation of the Bonneville power program was completed. At that time we were rapidly drifting into the second World

War. The President recognized the situation when he addressed the joint session of May 1940 and advised the Congress that he was setting up a Defense Advisory Commission. A few days later the personnel of this Commission was announced. I then thought it advisable to call the Pacific Northwest's power and metal resources to the attention of this Commission.

Accordingly, I discussed this with the congressional delegation and it was decided to present factual material to the Commission's Chairman, Mr. Stettinius. With this in view, I made the engagement for the delegation, which called on him in June 1940. At that time Mr. Stettinius stated he was being hard pressed in organization work, but if we would bring the delegation together again the following week he would send his experts to the Hill to discuss this subject. In accordance with such a plan, a meeting was arranged in Senator HOLMAN's office, and Senator McNARY was invited to preside. Mr. Stettinius sent Messrs. William Batt, Gano Dunn, Leith, and Holden to represent him. Our congressional delegation pointed out what Congress had done in the way of looking ahead on this situation by authorizing the installation of generating units at Bonneville and Grand Coulee and passing the Thomas Act. It was also forcefully pointed out that the Northwest had sufficient deposits of alunite clays, magnesium and chromium ores, as well as sufficient ferro-alloy deposits necessary to justify coupling the available hydro-power with material resources. After listening to our story the representatives of the Defense Commission advised us that the war-metal program did not need the full utilization of the facilities that Congress had provided. We were also told that sufficient metals were in sight to meet all the war requirements without any further expansion of power and production facilities.

At that time, the members of the delegation knew that the Axis Powers were actually producing two and a half times the light metals that were in sight in this country, and that we were in no position to provide what it would take for a successful air, ship, and ordnance program. The Defense Commission maintained this erroneous position until a year later, when Mr. Batt was forced to admit, before the Truman committee, that they were short in their estimates of capacity needed to meet the war effort. The story is clear. We now know that if the representatives of the Defense Commission had heeded the suggestions given them by the Northwest delegation in June 1940 we would have been some 20,000 to 25,000 planes ahead in our war program.

When I left this meeting, I had the firm conviction that decisions were being made by the war agencies in the interest of private profit rather than national security and that some responsible heads were being kept in ignorance. My own conclusions, which I stated freely and openly at that time have been fully vindicated. Ever since that June meeting, the same group of men has been in control of the war agencies. Every time I placed a proposition before them, their verbal

answers and their correspondence indicated evasion in order to cover up the fundamental errors made in that meeting.

I have given numerous speeches on the floor from time to time pointing out the evil effects of these decisions as applied to our air, ship, and ordnance programs. The record on this is complete, and if my speeches were read in parallel with the testimony before the Truman committee our people would secure a convincing picture.

No story of the controversy over electric power as applied to metals during the years 1940, 1941, and 1942 would be complete without mentioning the outstanding contribution in this field made by ex-Congressman Judge Leavy and especially his foresight in the urging of early authorization of the Grand Coulee generating units, and appropriations for pilot plants. Secretary Ickes, Dr. Raver, and their staffs saw the light early and urged, time after time, the same program we had offered in June of 1940. The war agencies refused to respect the mandates of Congress and the broad experience of Secretary Ickes' staff in the field of metals and power.

FEDERAL POWER CONTRIBUTION TO THE WAR

At the time that the expanded Bonneville plan was visualized and more or less agreed upon, 1933, the light-metal basic production program in the United States totaled about 330,000,000 pounds annually with an approximate power demand equivalent to 360,000 kilowatts. At this time the world equivalent kilowatt capacity was in excess of 1.5 million kilowatts, or 4 times that of the United States. In 1939, the light-metal utilization of Columbia River power was commenced at Vancouver. Today the Vancouver ingot aluminum plant alone is taking from Bonneville 180,000 kilowatts continuously, or 50 percent of the country's total 1938 production. In addition, about 225,000 kilowatts dedicated to ingot aluminum manufacture is in production at Troutdale, Oreg., and Tacoma, Longview, and Spokane, Wash. About 200,000 kilowatts more of like capacity is in process of construction at Troutdale and Spokane and will be in production within a few months.

The total ingot aluminum production from Columbia River power will amount to around 630,000 kilowatts, or about 180 percent of the 1938 national capability. It has been estimated that in the neighborhood of 70 percent of the air program light-metal requirements will come from Boulder, T. V. A., and Columbia River power. It is obvious without further comment, where this country would have been in its war program if Congress had not had the foresight to make this hydro capacity available at an early date.

In addition to these ingot aluminum plants, which, except Vancouver, are Federally financed, about 275,000 kilowatts of Columbia River power is going into shipbuilding, magnesium, ferro-silicon, chemicals, aluminum rolling, and naval and military establishments.

The total war use of Columbia River power now totals nearly 925,000 kilowatts, all at high-load factors. This

quantity of power is two times the New York City total consumption, and seven times that of Washington, D. C. This is as it should be, growing out of the original conception, born under the circumstances I have related. Bonneville Administrator Ross brought out the significance of this use in the first annual Bonneville report, page 20. Previous to that time I had accumulated material along this line, which I presented to the House on March 3, 1939. I am happy now in recalling that the foresight shown in 1937, 1938, and 1939 by Congress and the staffs of the Department of the Interior and the Budget has materialized into such a sizable war contribution. This subject should not be dismissed without referring to the excellent judgment exercised by the Bureau of the Budget, especially Mr. S. M. Dodd and his assistants. I distinctly remember discussing these points with these gentlemen in the days when the atmosphere was charged with doubt of the necessity for generating and transmitting plant expansion.

War contribution through Federal power was made possible in spite of apparent manipulation and lack of experience among those making major decisions in the war agencies. It is not as full as was warranted by the foresight and authorization of Congress and by the available resources. Adequate preparedness is never possible without foresight.

LACK OF BALANCE IN WAR PRODUCTION PROGRAM

In spite of this sizable Columbia River war contribution, my complaint has been and still is, that there was a year's time tragically lost, with resulting power waste and plane shortage. There was also a lack of full utilization of the power authorized by Congress, incorrect plant placements were made, with attendant waste of taxpayers' funds and of critical materials. Further, there was lack of balance in the development program, which will upset the future economy of the region, and is now preventing that great area from making the full contribution that its resources warrant, when we have complete airplane plants not in full production because of lack of critical basic materials. I have continuously stressed these points for the past 3 years by correspondence and interviews with the war agencies. I have placed the facts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that this material would be available for use when it is time for Congress to take a hand in straightening out a bad set-up. Other Members of the Senate and House have had the same experience. Secretary Ickes and his staff early put forth noble efforts to prevent such unbalance, when its disastrous results became apparent.

SHORTCOMINGS OF WAR AGENCIES

The reasons for much of the inefficiencies and ineffectiveness in war agency operations may be summarized as follows:

First. The influence of monopolistic interests on R. F. C., O. P. M., and W. P. B. personnel, and the determination to protect and preserve after-war monopoly.

Second. Reference of technical matters to corporation, hand-picked committees of national societies, like the National Academy of Science.

Third. Ignoring competent unbiased technical assistance available in other governmental agencies.

Fourth. Placing major technical decisions in inexperienced hands.

Fifth. Lack of definite inventory of regional resources, and the "know how" necessary to put these resources to work.

Sixth. Placing plant location authority in the hands of men unfamiliar with western and other sectional conditions outside the Atlantic border States.

Seventh. Subordination of public interest to private business group control.

Eighth. Lack of cost knowledge and unfamiliarity with pioneering methods.

Ninth. Ignoring mandates of Congress.

Tenth. Assumption of illegal powers and the application of the philosophy that the "King can do no wrong."

PROTECTING AFTER-WAR MONOPOLY

When the present indicated defense power loads on the Columbia system are in operation, the Defense Plant Corporation will have invested nearly \$150,000,000 of taxpayers' funds in these industrial facilities, and, in addition, the Bonneville Administration will have spent a sizeable amount in transmission lines and substation to serve such plants. The location and design of such industrial facilities are purposely such that they will have little economic use after the war. They do not use native raw materials but depend on materials transported great distances; for example, the use of Northwestern clays for processing aluminum has been prevented. The Northwest also has the base material for magnesium production; namely, power, magnetite, and saltwater; but a process was adopted that does not permit full use of such resources. Large ingot plants were built with provision only for a rolling mill. No extrusion or casting plants were provided, and the rolling mill is so located and of such a size that it cannot be economically operated at the lower load factors which will prevail in the post-war period.

The entire program is so out of balance and ill-planned that our region will have a distinct economic liability placed upon it in the post-war period. A constructive program could have been worked out, using native materials, and so sized and located as to be an asset to the region in years to come. Such unbalance is bound to result in later write-offs. In addition, costs have been increased because of the routing of handling priorities. This also will entail future write-offs.

There will be additional power capacity available for sale when the new Bonneville and Coulee generating units come into operation next summer. This capacity should be utilized in war metal industries located close to the generating stations; it should not be held idle. For 2 years our Members of Congress have urged heavy-load placement close to the generating plants as it was early evident that the use plan was going astray. This advice was ignored by war agencies.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND JESSE JONES—CONTROL SHOULD BE RENEGOTIATED

The recent Jesse Jones-Drew Pearson correspondence appearing in the Washington Post of November 13 and 19, 1942, is illuminating. If it is read closely, some points I have today mentioned are cleared up. Even Secretary Jones' letter of November 17, 1942, to the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer admits that the profits to the Aluminum Co. of America are figured on a power rate of 3 mills per kilowatt-hour "although a great deal of it costs the Defense Plant Corporation only 2 mills." The 2-mill power to which he refers is Columbia River power. This means that the 2-mill Columbia River power is being averaged with high-cost power in other sections of the country to lower the average power cost of the eight ingot plants operated by the Aluminum Co. but owned by the Government. Literally, this means that low-cost Columbia River power is being used to maintain and subsidize high-cost plants in other sections. This is another artifice to use the benefits of Northwestern power resources to take further industrial development away from the Northwest and place it elsewhere. Furthermore, under such a set-up, cheap taxpayers' power is being used to maintain high rates of the Arkansas Power & Light Co. and the Niagara Hudson Cos., contrary to the provisions of the Bonneville Act. All of these contracts should be renegotiated in order to save money for the taxpayers.

FURTHER DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE NORTHWEST

Congress authorized Coulee units 7, 8, and 9, and appropriated funds therefor, for the reason that this power was firm, continuous energy, which could be secured for lower price, quicker, and with less use of critical materials than any other hydropower in America. Nevertheless, W. P. B. saw fit to take the needed material for these units out of the priority schedules at the same time materials were allotted to high-cost, very low-load-factor machines elsewhere. The Northwest has had a long series of discriminatory decisions made against it.

I should state at this point, specifically, that I do not include all employees of the war agencies in my complaint. I appreciate the fact that these agencies have drawn a large number of sincere technical men from many sections of the country. These men, at great sacrifice, are trying to render a service of high order. The succeeding Congress will have to separate the wheat from the chaff.

POST-WAR ECONOMICS

Events covered by this statement I am making will have pronounced effect on the future economy of the Pacific Northwest. It will require a rebalancing of the program to correct these errors. This will become a paramount issue, both from the national and local standpoint. The sound utilization of the provided power and the latent resources of the ground and soil can offer a higher standard of living to farmers and workers. What is

needed is large power consuming basic-metal industries as close to the dams as is consistent with low-cost transportation. Such industries employ relatively few workers. The satellite fabricating industries using this intermediate ingot product, could be spread as widely as is economically possible. It is this supplementary type of industry that employs relatively large quantities of manpower but uses small quantities of electricity. Our industrial development depends on this type. The general rule should be violated only to the extent of using war-industry facilities already constructed.

TECHNICAL PLANNING AGENCY NEEDED

The Northwest needs a thoroughgoing nonduplicating agency, free from politics, to formulate a plan of regional coordinated long-range development of resources. No such agency exists in this country, save for the T. V. A. We have a number of Federal agencies dealing with parts of this problem, but there has been no coordination resulting in any real inventory of resources and practical development of the same. Such an agency should coordinate the post-war utilization of all types of war facilities.

After the close of the war some of the war industries will naturally shut down. This will result in energy being spilled over the dams. The public will not permit that energy to be so wasted. New permanent outlets must be found though a substantial amount of this power can be used in the natural load growth of the region, as the war has retarded such load growth. Lower retail rates will also increase use. This is another apparent problem of the post-war period. This particular problem should not be handled as was Muscle Shoals after the last war. The abuses of such handling resulted in the demand for the national yardstick.

When this post-war utilization of existing power facilities is settled, the preliminary work should be continued on Umatilla Rapids Dam. Much has been done already. Umatilla is also a low-cost power project, advantageously situated to supplement Bonneville and Grand Coulee, and is located in the center of a potential market. This also is a real task for those who follow me.

COLUMBIA RIVER AUTHORITY IS NEEDED

Our people should insist on the retention of the principles of the Bonneville Act, supplemented by acquisition authority, so that, when the people have exercised their right of local self-determination, private utility systems can be acquired and sold part by part to the local agencies. Such an amendment to the Bonneville Act will insure fair treatment, both to the legitimate investor and to the rate payer. The next Congress will be called upon to enact legislation to replace bills expiring with this Congress, upon which hearings have been held.

RATES

To effectuate the principle of widest possible use—section 2 (b) of the Bonneville Act—wholesale rates must be maintained at present levels or at lower levels whenever amortization permits reduction. Excess costs resulting from erroneous decisions of the war agencies

should not be capitalized into the rate structure; if this is allowed to happen, then the principle of widest use will be defeated, and the Columbia River project will degenerate into classic monuments to ineffective governmental operation and wartime corruption. This the people will not allow.

The permissible types of rate structures as well as the recovery requirements are amply provided in the present Bonneville Act.

Only one type of authorized rate structure is being used. The other—namely, zone rates—may be necessary in the future for heavy loads. The maintenance of such rate levels will require a close future check on investment because unit costs are bound to go up and remain relatively frozen as they did after the last war.

Future regional development will demand close attention to wholesale rates and future investments. This is another problem for those who sit in the Congress. Resale rates must of necessity be lowered to effectuate the principles of the Bonneville Act. This can be done without disturbing the financial soundness of the distributing agencies.

INTERCONNECTIONS

This matter of interconnections between public and private utilities is still a controversial point. In a good many quarters it is felt that the war agencies took upon themselves powers not authorized by Congress. This situation was anticipated by those responsible for the Bonneville Act and therefore protective provisions were written into law. Section 2 (b) of the act directs and authorizes interconnections only with other Federal projects or publicly owned power systems. There is no specific authorization covering private systems. Section 3 (b) of the act authorizes contracts with public or private systems for mutual exchanges of unused excess power, upon suitable exchange terms, for purposes of economical operation or providing emergency or break-down relief. This section does not authorize use of Federal funds for such physical construction nor does it permit siphoning out Columbia River power to supply private power deficiencies in other regions. The law specifically limits authorization to contracts involving mutual exchange of unused excess power. To hold back plant placement in order to create surplus power is a subterfuge. This contract authority is valid only when there is a mutual exchange of unused excess power. It does not authorize one-way traffic.

Those of us in Congress who are familiar with this subject realize that energy routes in a large pool are complex, and that no final policy decision can be made until the directional power flows are known. It seems to us who helped write this law, that the officials of W. P. B. should inform Congress as to their determination on unused excess power and salable power. We should know whether the use of interconnections will result in a mutual exchange of energy, and whether the use of the interconnections they advised will result in

revenues less than the Federal fixed charges. In addition, we need to be advised on the effect of interconnections on industrial placement, and whether such interconnection as has been ordered has not given the private companies control over the operation of a Federal investment, and insured them extra profits from war plants because of interconnections.

Historically, it should be recorded that the Bonneville Act was written just after the rejection of the pooling suggestion for T. V. A., and limitations were placed in this act to prevent the manipulation of Federal investment. Members from the great western regions will never be satisfied until the interconnection picture is clarified.

CONCLUSION

I have outlined the legislative history of Bonneville for the benefit of new Members and those interested in the preservation of natural resources. It has been a struggle to retain these resources for the use of all our people, and to prevent monopolization by limited groups. The struggle is not over. The next 10 years will indicate whether the established policy will continue. In order to be constructive, I have thus set forth some of the work yet to be done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Houston] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CONSPIRATORS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, there were some matters brought before us last week upon which by no means the last word was said. The public interest and the national security, in my opinion, require that the record be completed.

And I am confident that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hoffman], who brought up these subjects when he addressed the House a few days ago upon the point of personal privilege, will concur wholeheartedly with me in this objective.

The gentleman is celebrated in this House and throughout the Nation as a gifted and fluent orator. He is held in high esteem by all of us and I am sure that nothing that I have to say today will have any tendency whatever to diminish that esteem.

However, our unbounded admiration for the gentleman's character does not require of us that we shall always concur in his judgment. Nor does our respect for his elquence compel our agreement with all that he has said.

The right of personal privilege is a precious and necessary prerogative of this House, for it assures to us all a forum in which we may reply to unfair attack and unjustified calumny. Sometimes it has happened that some of us, coming before the House in righteous indignation, have forgotten that this precious privilege imposes upon us the obligation to be fair to others.

When any of us have erred merely by remarks about individuals, that may well be left to its own settlement, but when what is said here goes so far as to compromise the public interest, I cannot but

feel that the record ought to be made straight and complete.

The gentleman from Michigan took occasion the other day to deny certain imputations that had been made against his loyalty and his patriotism. There is not a one of us who does not believe him and extend him our sympathy in any attack that may be made upon his integrity.

The gentleman took occasion also to urge upon us adoption of his resolution for an investigation into what he says is a conspiracy to smear Members of Congress. And, of course, if there is any such conspiracy, or any probable cause for supposing that there is one, then it is an extremely serious matter.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is a serious matter also to stand here upon this floor and make shameful charges against people who have no such forum in which to defend themselves. It is a serious matter to make grave charges against the officers of the Government.

The gentleman spoke of a conspiracy which he said had been undertaken against him and others by the Special Assistant to the Attorney General, Mr. William Power Maloney, by a reporter for the Washington Post, Mr. Dillard Stokes, by the newspaper publisher, Mr. Marshall Field, and by various other persons and organizations. The gentleman did some smearing on his own account, it seems to me, when he linked them with the convict Communist, Earl Browder, with the Daily Worker, and others of like stripe.

This seems the more unjust and deplorable in view of Mr. Maloney's distinguished record of public service and of the enmity which the Communists have for Mr. Stokes.

However, it is not my purpose to presume to defend either of these two gentlemen. They have been smeared before on this floor and there is no doubt that they are perfectly able to take care of themselves. Doubtless so can the others.

What I am concerned with is the public interest that is affected by these broad charges that were made upon this floor. The gentleman from Michigan had a great deal to say about a grand jury and he mentioned that somebody had been indicted.

But he left the definite impression that all this grand jury activity was part of this conspiracy which he talks about, and that there had been grave irregularity in the proceedings. Now if he has any evidence of this, I think it is proper for him to produce it—moreover I think there is an obligation upon him, a public duty, to bring it out.

I mean to bring out the evidence—not to make a lot of wild and generalized charges without indicating in any way whether there is any evidence to support them.

Now when the gentleman from Michigan was on his feet he gave the definite impression that the grand jury activities of which he was speaking were part of some kind of horrid plot against him.

He did not inform the House that the grand jury and the prosecutors upon whom he heaped his slurs and insinua-

tions have indicted and convicted the German agent, Frank B. Burch—the man who sold out our country for \$10,000 cash in hand, paid by the German consul in Cleveland. And Burch pleaded guilty. He admitted it.

He did not recall when he was speaking that the same grand jury and prosecutors indicted and sent to jail the notorious German agent, George Sylvester Viereck—the Kaiser's hireling in the first war and Hitler's henchman in this one.

The gentleman did not mention that other fellow, the paid servant of this German agent, Viereck, the man who was a clerk to a Member of this House, who went to jail for perjury after he tried to obstruct the investigation of this damnable Nazi propaganda machine.

All of them convicted, Mr. Speaker, in open court by juries of American citizens.

And when the gentleman was insinuating that the grand jurors misbehaved, that something was wrong with their proceedings, that it was all a smear campaign, the gentleman did not go into any detail about who had been indicted—about those 28 defendants who are scheduled to go on trial before the Federal courts for seditious conspiracy.

Of course, this is no trivial criminal case, it is no ordinary matter. Such a conspiracy when our country is fighting for survival, such a plot in aid and comfort of the enemy, is very far indeed from being an ordinary matter.

But the gentleman from Michigan did not refer to this as a prosecution, but as a smear. He did not draw the issue between the Government and its enemies, but between the administration and its critics.

Suppose the gentleman has been smeared. We all know him and we all know how to regard his integrity, so we know that if ill has been said of him it is certainly a smear.

And certainly the gentleman ought to defend himself. He would be false to his duty as a Member of this House if he did not.

But, Mr. Speaker, does he really mean to make common cause with these conspirators?

I cannot believe it, Mr. Speaker; I cannot believe that he would degrade himself to the level of these 28 plotters who have been accused—not by the administration but by a grand jury of 23 American citizens.

Yet, he insinuates that these 28 persons are victims of a persecution, of a conspiracy between Mr. Maloney and Mr. Stokes, and all these other people.

I wish the gentleman would clear that up. Does he say that these 28 conspirators are not guilty? Does he say that any of them are not guilty? And if so, what are their names?

I do not know whether they are guilty or not. All I know is that they are who they are, and they have been indicted by a grand jury, and they have the benefit of the same legal presumption of innocence that clothes any and every citizen until he is proved guilty.

What I want to find out is, What does the gentleman know about it? Has he

any evidence that they are innocent? Has he made an investigation of his own? And if so, which of these conspirators does he say are being persecuted? What are their names?

These people are accused of a cold and studied plot to foment disloyalty and mutiny in the armed forces of the United States. Not only before Pearl Harbor, but this year, while our men have been dying in battle and this Capital has been blacked out in preparation for enemy air raids.

That indictment was returned after months of investigation, after a hundred witnesses besides the gentleman from Michigan were called to give the Government the benefit of whatever information they had.

Those are the charges against these 28 people, whom the gentleman says are the victims of persecution.

And I say this House and the people of the United States are entitled to know whether he makes this assertion for the whole 28, or only some of them, and if only some of them, then which ones?

And we are entitled to have the gentleman tell us the basis of his assertion—he ought to tell us what evidence he has that causes him to pit his judgment against that of the Federal grand jury.

Does the gentleman, for example, claim that George Sylvester Viereck, the notorious Nazi agent, was persecuted when he was indicted for conspiracy?

Does the gentleman make any such claim in behalf of the Japanese agent, Ralph Townsend—the notorious paid hireling of the Japanese Government who admitted the fact in open court, when he pleaded guilty before Mr. Justice Goldsborough—our distinguished former colleague—in this very city?

Does he claim William Dudley Pelley, the Silver Shirt Fuehrer who was indicted and convicted of sedition by the Federal courts in Indiana this summer—does he claim Pelley is being persecuted?

Does the gentleman claim the indictment of Ellis O. Jones and Robert Noble is a persecution—those two Nazi-praising Fascists who were convicted a few weeks ago in the California State courts? Does he claim they are being persecuted?

Does he claim this conspiracy indictment is a persecution of William Kullgren, the fake astrologer who praised Hitler and hinted for the assassination of President Roosevelt?

Does he claim Prescott Dennett, the hireling of George Sylvester Viereck, is being persecuted?

Does he claim Court Asher, the publisher of the X-Ray, is persecuted, or the two Garners who used to put out the scurrilous paper Publicity in Wichita, Kans.? Those two papers have been suppressed for sedition after open hearings and the Garners are under indictment in Kansas for sedition as well as in Washington for conspiracy. Does the gentleman's protestations of a plot embrace these men within its protection?

Does the gentleman claim H. Victor Broenstrup is being persecuted? Broenstrup, Pelley's ex-lawyer, the man with the alias of Lieutenant General Cherup-Spi-rod-ovich? This Broen-

strupp was caught a few days ago after being in hiding for 4 months. Is he being persecuted?

There are others in that indictment, and they all are of the same stripe. Does the gentleman say they are persecuted?

Which ones?

These people were circulating their damnable propaganda against our Nation and our Government. The gentleman was enraged the other day, because the newspaper reporter, Mr. Stokes, had investigated them. The gentleman was contemptuous of the cover names Mr. Stokes used in his inquiries.

I say it is a good thing somebody did investigate them.

I say we ought to be thankful we have citizens who have the boldness and the sagacity to strike out against these enemies of our country.

I say praise the Department of Justice for taking action.

I say these people who were working against these enemies deserve better treatment than to be slandered and vilified on the floor of this House.

The rage of the gentleman from Michigan I can understand; it appears from the indictment that some of these conspirators actually dared to make use of reprints of his speeches, the one in which he applied the term "Judas" to the President of the United States.

I do not blame the gentleman for not wanting to be associated with people like that.

But he had turned his fire on the wrong people. He ought to be mad at the conspirators, not at the reporters who dug up the facts or the prosecutors who acted on them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have a special order following the gentleman from Kansas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is correct. Does the gentleman object to additional time being granted to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. FISH. I am not objecting to additional time. I just want my own time. The gentleman from Kansas may proceed for as long as he wants after I get through.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from New York has no objection.

Mr. FISH. What I wish, Mr. Speaker, is the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman insists upon the regular order, he is, in effect, objecting to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall not ask for additional time, but ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from committee, which was read by the Clerk:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 12, 1942.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

RESTORATION OF REPRESENTATIVE AND CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have today submitted my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, on which I have served for the past 22 years, in order to devote my entire time in the new Congress, as a member of the Committee on Rules, to the restoration of representative and constitutional government in the United States.

I believe this to be a direct mandate from the American people, who are exasperated at having their daily lives regimented by Executive orders and regulations emanating from bureaucrats and governmental agencies without authority of law and often in defiance of Congress and the Constitution.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I cannot yield right now.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOOK. Such a brilliant speech should not go without an audience; we ought to have a quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman make the point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. HOOK. Unless the gentleman yields I will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. FISH. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOOK. I was just wondering whether the gentleman felt there was any moral laxity in the Harding and Hoover administrations.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman interrupted my remarks before I had made clear my views. I am discussing what I believe to be the need for the restoration of representative and constitutional government. I never heard that under the Harding, Hoover, or any other Presidential regime the powers of Congress had been usurped by bureaucrats in Washington. That is the point I am discussing. Possibly the gentleman will agree with me by the time I have finished my statement.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FISH. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. HOOK. Does the gentleman feel that Teapot Dome was not a bureaucratic action?

Mr. FISH. That had nothing to do with bureaucratic rule, but was a matter of one individual violating the law, and I think every Republican and every Democrat is against corruption in the Federal service.

Mr. HOOK. Can the gentleman say—and does he honestly feel—that we do not have a constitutional government at this time?

Mr. FISH. I do not believe we have it at all. I believe the bureaucrats, in defiance of the Congress and of the Constitution, are taking the laws into their own hands. That is what I would like to discuss, if the gentleman will permit me to continue.

It is the duty of the new Congress to exert its influence to put an end to government by nonelected bureaucrats and to restore a government by law—reestablishing the Congress as the sole Federal legislative authority in the Nation.

The Committee on Rules, with its vast powers, should devote its energies and time to checking on the governmental agencies and requiring the bureaucrats to show by what authority of law they are taking into their own hands the legislative functions of the Congress.

I know of nothing more important for the new Congress to do than to reassert its own authority, legislative prerogatives, and power to stop the march to dictatorship and totalitarianism in our own country while our sons are fighting for the four freedoms throughout the world.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I would like to proceed with my speech. After I get through, I will yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Has the gentleman from New York yielded?

Mr. FISH. I would prefer that the gentleman ask me any questions when I get through.

Mr. HOOK. Do I understand that the gentleman said there is dictatorship and totalitarianism in this country at the present time?

Mr. FISH. I said, "Stop the march to dictatorship and totalitarianism in our own country." Those are the exact words.

Mr. HOOK. Does the gentleman insist that there is a march to dictatorship and totalitarianism in this country?

Mr. FISH. I thought everybody knew that. There are Members on the gentleman's own side who have expressed themselves upon the floor of this House in stronger terms than I have. I think the Governor of Alabama made a far stronger speech than I propose to make this afternoon on that issue only day before yesterday.

Mr. HOOK. I can assure the gentleman that there is no dictatorship and no march toward totalitarianism or dictatorship unless it is enhanced and brought about by those on your side who have been complaining and bewildering the public to that extent.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I think the American people know the facts and

voted their opposition to totalitarianism and dictatorship last month.

In carrying out this program, the Congress should investigate all attempts to undermine the authority of the legislative branch of the Government by individuals, organizations, or governmental agencies, including efforts designed to destroy freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and representative and constitutional government.

It is with regret that I resign from the Committee on Foreign Affairs where, as ranking Republican member, in the present Congress, I led the fights to prevent the destruction of the Neutrality Act, the adoption of the lend-lease bill, and other measures that, in my opinion, would provoke or involve us in war. I did everything I could, according to my convictions and the will of the people, to keep America out of war unless attacked.

Although there were approximately 100 more Democrats in the House than Republicans, some of these controversial war measures were adopted by very few votes in spite of the administration's overwhelming majority. However, once we were attacked, I, along with other Members of Congress, voted for war and have supported all war measures since in order to win an all-out victory at the earliest possible moment.

I have yet to find any of the noninterventionists in Congress who have apologized for having voted their honest convictions in opposition to measures they believed were leading us step by step into war. They voted on all those pre-war measures on the basis of what they believed to be for the best interests of America and for the preservation of peace. I do not know how to perform political somersaults, or, for the sake of expediency, to repudiate what I believed in at the time; or to applaud now, for political purposes, that which I rejected only a year ago. I am firmly convinced that my views are identical with all other pre-war noninterventionists in Congress.

The controversial issues between the interventionists and noninterventionists were sunk at Pearl Harbor, but that has not deterred a very small, rabid group of interventionists in both parties from attempting to revive these pre-war issues, which is a disservice to our country and tends to undermine national unity and impede our all-out war efforts.

I have never challenged the patriotism or Americanism of any interventionists for wanting to get us into war prior to Pearl Harbor—that was his or her right as a free sovereign American citizen. I do deplore, and will oppose, any attempts from whatever source to impugn the motives or patriotism of any noninterventionist Members of Congress who sought, in accordance with his convictions, to keep us out of war unless attacked.

In resigning from the Committee on Foreign Affairs to devote my entire time to the work of the Rules Committee toward restoring representative and constitutional government, I shall continue to be interested in our foreign policies and the right of the Congress to participate in the making of a just and lasting peace after the war has been won.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I want to assure the gentleman from New York, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly do not doubt his sincerity, his patriotism, or his Americanism in any respect; but from the tenor of the statement made by the gentleman I would gather that he thought and he still thinks it was a mistake on the part of this Congress to pass the lend-lease bill and those various other preparedness measures. I may be wrong about that.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is certainly not wrong. I have just stated, if he had listened to me, that I thought those controversial measures were steps toward war. I so stated at the time and I just told the House very clearly that I did not propose and did not know how to perform a political somersault. I voted my convictions and I do not know of a single Member of Congress who cares to change any vote that he cast at that time under those circumstances. I also pointed out that now that we are in the war, I am for all-out war measures to win the war as soon as possible. I think the gentleman has a right to his views, and I think I made very clear what my views were at that time and still are.

Mr. EBERHARTER. As I stated in the first place, I am sure the gentleman is sincere in his views and was at the time he took the action he did in respect to these various measures. What I want to have cleared up is the following: Does the gentleman think those various measures on the part of the Congress of the United States are the matters that provoked the war upon the United States?

Mr. FISH. I certainly do and said so many times on the floor of the House. Every time such a bill came up I maintained that it was another step toward war. The gentleman is not going to change my record of voting in any possible respect. I campaigned on that record in my own district and defended it both in the primary and the election.

Mr. EBERHARTER. To follow that through, then, the gentleman believes that this country's being in the war is the fault of this country and the acts of its Congress?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from Pennsylvania knows that we were attacked by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and that I, with other Members of the House, voted on December 8 for war because we were attacked. Every time I opposed these measures as steps leading to war I stated that in case of attack I would vote for war.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, the gentleman, for historical purposes, would take the position this country wanted to go to war and therefore the Congress passed these measures?

Mr. FISH. Some of our people did want to go to war and said so, and had the right to say so. I do not know whether the gentleman was one of those or not. But many of his friends wanted to go to war and some people in and out of Congress favored our entrance into the war and had a perfect right to say so and I have never questioned patriotism or Americanism for expressing such views.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The majority of the Congress of the United States voted for those measures.

Mr. FISH. Most of these votes were close in the House. Eighty percent of the American people wanted to stay out of war unless attacked. I was one of the 80 percent. That was the will of the American people. I do not propose to change the record of the Congress as it is history and speaks for itself.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I want the Record to be clear, if the gentleman will permit me for just a moment.

The gentleman stated that all these steps were steps that were responsible for this country's being in the war.

Mr. FISH. I said I thought at the time and still think that many of these controversial measures were steps toward war. I think we made that very clear at the time, and I think 80 percent of the American people knew about it and wanted to stay out of war unless attacked. Once we were attacked we became a united Nation and interventionists and noninterventionists are now marching shoulder to shoulder to victory.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then the gentleman said that a majority of the Congress of the United States wanted war because they voted for these measures.

Mr. FISH. Very few people wanted war, a very small vociferous minority, but they had a right to their views. Most of the Members of Congress were opposed to war and said so repeatedly even when voting for these pre-war measures.

PROTESTING MASSACRE OF JEWS IN CONQUERED TERRITORY

Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to read a letter which I have addressed to the Secretary of State, dated December 10, 1942. The letter speaks for itself:

DECEMBER 10, 1942.

HON. CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been shocked by the repeated statements appearing in the American press concerning the alleged slaughter of 7,000 Jews daily by the Nazis in conquered territories.

I would appreciate receiving from you any data that you may have concerning such atrocities and any suggestions you may care to make that might help to put a stop to the massacre of Jews in central and eastern Europe.

I quote from a letter signed by Pierre Van Paasen, of the Committee for a Jewish Army, published in the New York Times of December 5, 1942: "To be silent in this hour when thousands of unarmed, innocent Jewish human beings are murdered each day is not only a betrayal of elementary human solidarity, it is tantamount to giving the blood-thirsty Gestapo carte blanche to continue and speed its ghastly program of extermination. To be silent is to help Hitler carry out his program of killing off one people today—another people, perhaps the Poles, tomorrow, and Czechs and Yugoslavs the day after tomorrow, etc."

Is there not some action that may be taken by the United States Congress and the administration that will stop these pogroms of Jews in Poland and eastern Europe? Would it be possible to enlist the support of such neutrals as Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, and Turkey?

I am and always have been against the persecution of minorities here and abroad on account of race, color or creed and shall be glad to cooperate in Congress in any constructive way to stop this wholesale murder

and butchery of defenseless people. In the meantime I am in favor of giving the Jewish people arms and equipment and an opportunity to fight in Palestine, north Africa, and to participate in the Allied invasion of Europe. Why should not the Jews of Palestine and Europe be permitted to form their own fighting units such as the Poles, Czechs, Greeks, Free French, and now Free Austrians?

Thanking you for any information or suggestions you may care to send me and with kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

Mr. Speaker, since I wrote this letter to the Secretary of State the Free Polish Government in exile has written a note to all civilized nations authenticating the fact that one-third of the Jewish population of Poland has already been exterminated, and that orders have been given by the Gestapo to exterminate 50 percent during the balance of this year. This substantiates the statement I made in my letter to the Secretary of State.

I think all Americans, regardless of party or creed or color, agree that it is a horrifying picture that in our time and generation a race can be exterminated under the stress of war, yet we have not taken any concrete action so far. I hope the next Congress will act and cooperate with the administration to ask the neutral nations of the world to try to put an end to this murderous program against the Jews in Central Europe and Poland.

HON. ARTHUR W. MITCHELL

Among the Members of the House who are retiring voluntarily is the gentleman from Illinois, ARTHUR W. MITCHELL, an able, courageous, and distinguished Representative and the only Negro in Congress. He has under many trying circumstances conducted himself with credit to his constituents and to his race as an American and patriot. While we are fighting for the four freedoms throughout the world we should make sure in winning the war that our own people have these same freedoms in America. There is no reason with over 12,000,000 colored American citizens that they should not have additional representation in the Congress.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 644. An act for the relief of Hiller & Wilbur, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1214. An act to provide for the payment of the claim of John C. Shaw, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Sydney C. McLouth, deceased, arising out of a contract between said deceased and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, for the construction of seagoing tugs; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2176. An act for the relief of the heirs of John J. Shields; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2375. An act for the relief of Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, and Margaret Groom Turpin; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2610. An act for the relief of Richard Barker; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2899. An act to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7575. An act to expedite the prosecution of war, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1666. An act to coordinate Federal reporting services, to eliminate duplication and reduce the cost of such services, and to minimize the burdens of furnishing information to Federal agencies;

S. 2341. An act to amend the act approved March 14, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for vacations for Government employees, and for other purposes";

S. 2353. An act to amend sections 1305 and 1306 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to eliminate the prohibition against payment of deposits, and interest thereon, of enlisted men until final discharge;

S. 2769. An act to authorize the rank of rear admiral in the Dental Corps of the United States Navy;

S. 2852. An act to authorize the President to confer decorations and medals upon units of, or persons serving with, the military forces of cobelligerent nations; and

S. 2889. An act to further the war effort by authorizing the substitution of other materials for strategic metals used in minor coinage, to authorize the forming of worn and uncurrent standard silver dollars into bars, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did, on December 12, 1942, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4923. An act for the relief of the estate of Orion Knox, deceased; and

H. R. 6410. An act for the relief of Alex Gamble.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LARRABEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 15, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in open hearing on Tuesday, December 15, 1942, at 10:30 a. m., to consider the report made by the General Accounting Office on the Waterman Steamship Corporation.

Consideration will be given such other matters as the committee may deem appropriate at that time.

It is hoped that as many members as possible may be present at that time.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2036. A letter from the Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting the third report upon the operations of the War Pro-

duction Board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2037. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 23, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Fond du Lac River and tributaries, Wisconsin, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

2038. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 25, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a reexamination of the White River, with a view to providing further improvement in the pool formed by lock and dam No. 1, near Batesville, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 17, 1940; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2039. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on lists of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

2040. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries in connection with the war up to October 31, 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2041. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter urging enactment of legislation relative to adjusting wages and hours for Federal Government employees, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Territories. Supplemental report to part 2, to accompany H. R. 7463. A bill transferring of land from the jurisdiction of the Hawaiian Homes Commission for expansion of airports on Molokai at Hilo, Hawaii, T. H.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2726). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 2239. An act to encourage the discovery of oil and gas on the public domain during the continuance of the present war; with amendment (Rept. No. 2730). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 2385. An act to provide for the probate and distribution of restricted estates not exceeding \$2,500 in value of deceased Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma; without amendment (Rept. No. 2731). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 2744. An act to reimpose the trust on certain lands allotted to Indians of the Klamath River Reservation, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2732). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 2829. An act to eliminate certain lands from the Wapato Indian Irrigation project, Yakima Reservation, Wash., cancel and adjust certain charges, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2733). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 2830. An act to provide relief to the owners of former Indian-owned land within the Oroville-Tonasket irrigation district, Washington, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2734). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7105. A bill to provide for the suspension, during the war, of operating-differential subsidy agreements, and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2735). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 5948. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act so as to provide for reapportionment of the membership of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii and to create districts from which said representatives shall be elected, and to authorize the said legislature to provide for reapportionment within each county of the membership of the senate of said legislature and to create districts from which said senators shall be elected; with amendment (Rept. No. 2736). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 6461. A bill to authorize the incorporated city of Anchorage, Alaska, to purchase and improve the electric light and power system of the Anchorage Light & Power Co., Inc., an Alaska corporation, and for such purpose to issue bonds in the sum of not to exceed \$1,250,000 in excess of present statutory debt limits; without amendment (Rept. No. 2737). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7744. A bill to provide that employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine shall be restored to their positions upon the termination of such service; with amendment (Rept. No. 2738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 7863. A bill for the relief of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7864. A bill to amend the act of September 22, 1941, Public Law 252, Seventy-seventh Congress, with relation to the temporary appointments of officers in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. J. Res. 369. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of 1,500 copies of a revision of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL introduced a bill (H. R. 7865) for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Jasper and Pauline Cuccio (minors), which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3489. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Resolution adopted by Story County, Iowa, Bankers As-

sociation, dated November 18, 1942, protesting against Production Credit Association lending; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3490. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Wisconsin Cannery Association, Madison, Wis.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3491. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Ruth A. Levendahl, secretary, student branch, American Pharmaceutical Association, College of Pharmacy, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, and fellow students, urging the passage of House bill 7432 and Senate bill 2690 to establish a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3492. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Queens County Board, Ancient Order of Hibernians, affirming its appreciation of the confidence reposed in William Griffin on occasions by our beloved President of the United States and by many distinguished citizens of the United States of various racial and religious origins and affiliations, and expressing its sincere belief that the said William Griffin is devoted to our United States Constitution and our American ideals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3493. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce, Springfield, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the death of Hon. Phil A. Bennett; to the Committee on Memorials.

3494. Also, petition of the Acting Secretary of the Interior, petitioning consideration of resolution dated July 24, 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, November 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all Grace and Love, trusting only in Thy mercy would we seek Thy face. We come asking not that Thy will be bent to our whim but that Thy completeness flow around our incompleteness, and around our restlessness Thy rest.

May the Christmas Cradle bring to us a penitent revelation of our towering self-sufficiency and the realization that in our smart sophistication we have so often mistaken knowledge for truth and cleverness for wisdom; and so, alas, have trusted in a wisdom that is not wise. May the Christmas skies and song shed new wonder and mystic meaning on tasks as commonplace as that of shepherds watching their flocks by night. And may the Christmas climate, with its balmy breezes of good will, melt cold unbrotherliness, touching the bleak and barren areas of unbelief into the blossomed loveliness of a spiritual springtime. In that sunny domain unmarred by the blighting frost of disillusionment and intolerance may there bloom the fragrant flowers of humility and sweet charity.

We ask it in the ever blessed Name of that One at whose birth the angels sang and wise men hastened, and of whom the holy prophets declared, "And the gov-

ernment shall be upon His shoulder." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, December 11, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On December 11, 1942:

S. 2292. An act for the relief of Fred Walker, Sr., legal guardian for Fred Walker, Jr.; the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; and

S. 2742. An act for the relief of Guy E. Mish.

On December 12, 1942:

S. 2195. An act for the relief of Charles E. Salmons.

On December 14, 1942:

S. 2268. An act to further amend section 126 of the act of June 3, 1916, as amended, to authorize travel pay for certain military and naval personnel on discharge or release or relief from active duty;

S. 2422. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to designate the titles of certain offices and departments of instruction at the United States Military Academy;

S. 2619. An act to amend Article of War 114 so as to broaden the power to administer oaths and take acknowledgments;

S. 2891. An act to amend paragraph 8, section 127a, of the National Defense Act so as to authorize certain service to be counted in determining precedence among officers when dates of rank are the same; and

S. 2867. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 140) granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General (retired) of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of Colombia, Haiti, and Chile.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 4918. An act for the relief of Anna J. Krogoli;

H. R. 7357. An act for the relief of Madeleine Flori;

H. R. 7522. An act to amend the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, so as to authorize the use of public-school buildings in the District of Columbia as and for day nurseries and nursery schools, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7587. An act for the relief of Etta A. Thompson, Marion E. Graham, Irene Morgan, and Alice K. Weber.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 5486. An act to provide for means of egress for buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5812. An act for the relief of William E. Averitt and United States Casualty Co;